# DOCUMENT RESUME

| | |
|---|---|
| ED 264 330 | UD 024 595 |

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Refugee Resettlement Program. Report to the Congress. |
| INSTITUTION | Office of Refugee Resettlement (DHHS), Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | 31 Jan 85 |
| NOTE | 258p. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Descriptive (141) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC11 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Adjustment (to Environment); Demography; Employment; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; *Refugees; Relocation; Resource Allocation; State Federal Aid; State Programs; Voluntary Agencies |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Immigration Legislation; *Refugee Resettlement Program |

## ABSTRACT

This report covers activities carried out under provisions for federally funded refugee programs from October 1983 through September 1984. Part I lists the reporting requirements of Section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980, and identifies where each requirement is addressed in the report's text and appendices. Part II describes the domestic refugee settlement programs and discusses the following areas: (1) admissions quotas and the number of refugees admitted from various countries; (2) initial reception and replacement activities; (3) funds allocated for various activities such as State-administered programs, matching grant programs, refugee health, refugee education, national discretionary projects, program evaluation, and data and data system development; and (4) key Federal legislative activities. Part III details the characteristics of refugees resettled in the United States since 1975, and includes a profile of the refugees, their geographic location and patterns of movement, the current employment status of Southeast Asian refugees, and the number of refugees who adjusted their immigration status during FY 1984. Finally, Part IV discusses the plans of the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement to improve the refugee program in 1985. Appended are statistical tables, Federal agency reports, a list of State refugees coordinators, and a list of refugee health programs funded in various States by the Centers for Disease Control. (GC)

***********************************************************************

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *

* from the original document. *

***********************************************************************

ED264330

(11)

REPORT TO
THE CONGRESS

JANUARY 31, 1985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

# Refugee Resettlement Program

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

U.S. Dept. of Health &
Human Services, DC.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Social Security Administration
Office of Refugee Resettlement

UD 024595

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980, requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services in consultation with the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs to submit a report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program no later than January 31 following the end of each fiscal year. This report, which covers refugee program developments from October 1, 1983, through September 30, 1984, is the eighteenth in a series of reports to Congress on refugee resettlement in the U.S. since 1975 -- and the fourth to cover an entire year of activities carried out under the comprehensive authority of the Refugee Act of 1980. It consists of a text in four parts and five accompanying appendices and was prepared by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR).

## PART I

Part I lists the specific reporting requirements of Section 413(a) and identifies where each requirement is discussed in the text and appendices.

## PART II

Part II describes the domestic refugee resettlement programs. Highlights from each section are listed below.

### Admissions

- President Reagan set a refugee admissions ceiling of 72,000 for FY 1984. Approximately 70,600 refugees actually entered the United States during that period.
- As in FY 1983, the large majority of refugees admitted in FY 1984 came from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos -- 52,000. Of the total refugee arrivals in FY 1984, 74 percent were from East Asia, 15 percent were from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, 7 percent were from the Near East and South Asia, 4 percent were from Africa, and less than 1 percent were from Latin America and the Caribbean.

### Initial Reception and Placement Activities

- In FY 1984, twelve private voluntary resettlement agencies and two State agencies were responsible for the reception and initial placement of refugees through cooperative agreements with the Department of State.
- During FY 1984, the Bureau for Refugee Programs in the Department of State conducted in-depth reviews of voluntary agency activities in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Tampa/St. Petersburg, Florida; Providence, Rhode Island; Portland, Oregon; and the State of South Carolina.

## Domestic Resettlement Program

- Refugee Appropriations: ORR received $541.9 million in FY 1984 for the costs of assisting refugees and Cuban and Haitian entrants as provided for under the Refugee Act of 1980. Of this, States received $357.1 million for the costs of providing cash and medical assistance to eligible refugees, aid to unaccompanied refugee children, social services, and State and local administrative costs.

- State-Administered Program: In order to receive assistance under the refugee program, a State is required by the Refugee Act and by regulation to submit a plan which describes the nature and scope of the State's program and gives assurances that the program will be administered in conformity with the Act.

    - Cash and Medical Assistance: Based on information provided by the States in Quarterly Performance Reports to ORR, approximately 53.9 percent of eligible refugees who had been in the U.S. three years or less were receiving some form of cash assistance at the end of FY 1984. This compares with an approximate cash assistance utilization rate of 53.4 percent for September 1983 -- one year earlier. The rate continued to vary widely by State.

    - Social Services: In FY 1984, ORR provided approximately $67 million for a broad range of social services to refugees and entrants such as English language training and employment-related training.

    - Targeted Assistance: ORR received a final appropriation of $77.5 million for targeted assistance activities for refugees and entrants, with these funds remaining available until the end of FY 1985. At the end of FY 1984, ORR had obligated approximately $37.5 million, or about half of the total. Targeted assistance funds were directed to areas where, because of factors such as unusually large refugee and entrant populations, high refugee and entrant concentrations, and high use of public assistance, there existed a specific need for supplementation of other available service resources for the refugee and entrant population.

    - Unaccompanied Refugee Children: Since 1979, when the unaccompanied minors program began, a total of 5,733 children have entered the program. The number remaining in the program as of September 30, 1984 was 3,694 -- an increase of 8.1 percent from the 3,407 a year earlier. States reporting the largest numbers of unaccompanied children served were New York (771), California (475), Illinois (331), and Minnesota (329).

-- Program Monitoring: ORR efforts to monitor the State-administered refugee resettlement program focused on four key areas in FY 1984: (1) Program management guidance; (2) technical assistance; (3) direct field monitoring and casefile review; and (4) followup. Where deficiencies in the State system suggested potential overpayment of refugee funds, ORR recommended that formal audits be conducted.

o Matching Grant Program: Grants totaling $4 million were awarded under the matching grant program in FY 1984 whereby Federal funds of up to $1,000 per refugee are provided on a matching basis for national voluntary resettlement agencies to provide assistance and services to eligible refugees. In FY 1984, five voluntary agencies, including two agencies which had not previously participated in the program, were selected by the Director of ORR for funding.

o Refugee Health: The Public Health Service continued to station public health advisors in Southeast Asia to monitor the health screening of U.S.-destined refugees; to maintain quarantine officers to inspect refugees at the U.S. ports-of-entry; to notify State and local health agencies of new arrivals, especially those requiring followup health care; and to administer approximately $6.1 million in ORR-funded monies to State and local health departments for the conduct of refugee health assessments.

o Refugee Education: $16.6 million was distributed to school districts in FY 1984 to meet the special educational needs of children at the elementary and secondary levels.

o National Discretionary Projects: ORR obligated about $4.7 million in FY 1984 to support projects to improve refugee resettlement operations at the national, regional, State, and community levels. Among those projects were demonstration projects to increase the number of wage earners in refugee and entrant households, planned secondary resettlement grants, and a refugee mental health demonstration project, to name a few.

o Program Evaluation: During FY 1984, contracts were awarded for: An Assessment of Refugee Program Alternatives, an Evaluation of the Highland Lao Initiative, and an Evaluation of the Targeted Assistance Grant Program. The following study was contracted in FY 1983 and remains in progress: A Study of Refugee Utilization of Public Medical Assistance. The following studies were completed in FY 1984: An Evaluation of the Favorable Alternate Sites Project; Health Service Utilization Patterns of Southeast Asian Refugees: Rhode Island Medicaid/Refugee Medical Assistance; Refugee Earnings and Utilization of Financial Assistance Programs; Residency Patterns and Secondary Migration of Refugees; and Labor Force Participation and Employment of Southeast Asian Refugees in the U.S.

- Data and Data System Development: Development and maintenance of ORR's computerized data system on refugees continued during FY 1984. Records were on file by the end of FY 1984 for approximately 820,000 out of a possible 935,000 refugees who have entered the U.S. since 1975.

## Key Federal Activities

- Congressional Consultations on Refugee Admissions: Consultations with the Congress on refugee admissions took place in September 1984 as required by the Refugee Act of 1980. President Reagan set a world-wide refugee admissions ceiling for the U.S. at 70,000 for FY 1985.

- Reauthorization of the Refugee Act of 1980, as amended: During FY 1984, the House passed legislation to reauthorize the Refugee Act of 1980, as amended. The Senate, however, did not complete action on the legislation by the close of FY 1984. Funds for the refugee program were appropriated under the Continuing Resolution for FY 1985.

## PART III

Part III details the characteristics of refugees resettled in the U.S. since 1975, and includes a profile of the refugees, their geographic location and patterns of movement, the current employment status of Southeast Asian refugees, and the number of refugees who adjusted their immigration status during FY 1984.

## Population Profile

- Southeast Asians remain the most numerous of the recent refugee arrivals. The number arriving in the United States increased in FY 1984 compared with FY 1983. Nearly 711,000 were in the U.S. at the end of FY 1984, and, of these, about 7 percent had been in the U.S. less than one year, and only 23 percent had been in the country for three years or less.

- Vietnamese are still the majority group among the refugees from Southeast Asia, although the proportional ethnic composition of the entering population has become more diverse over time. By the end of FY 1984, Vietnamese made up 65 percent of the total, 20 percent were from Laos, and about 15 percent were from Cambodia.

- Southeast Asian refugees live in every State and several territories of the United States. Migration to California continued to affect refugee population distribution during FY 1984, but at the same time several Eastern States experienced significant growth due to both secondary migration and initial placements of refugees.

- About 79.8 percent of Southeast Asian refugees are residing in fourteen States. Of these fourteen States, the top thirteen were also the top thirteen States in terms of Southeast Asian populations one year previously, at the close of FY 1983. California, Texas, and Washington have held the top three positions since 1980.

## Economic Adjustment

- The Fall 1984 refugee survey contracted by ORR indicated that 55 percent of the sampled Southeast Asian refugees aged 16 and over were in the labor force, as compared with 64 percent for the U.S. population as a whole. Of those, about 85 percent were actually able to find jobs, as compared with 93 percent for the U.S. population. Refugee labor force participation was thus lower than for the general U.S. population, and the unemployment rate was significantly higher.

- The kinds of jobs that refugees find in the United States generally are of lower status than those they held in their country of origin. For example, 57 percent of the employed adults sampled had held white collar jobs in their country of origin, but only 27 percent hold similar jobs in the U.S.

- The ability of Southeast Asian refugees to seek and find employment in the U.S. is the result of many factors: Condition of the labor market, demands of family life, health problems, and the decision to gain training and education prior to entering the job market.

- The major current refugee characteristic that influences successful involvement in the labor force is English language competence. As in previous surveys, English proficiency was found to have clear effects on labor force participation, on unemployment rates, and on earnings. Refugees who spoke no English had a labor force participation rate of only 19.6 percent and an unemployment rate of 32.3 percent. For refugees who spoke English fluently, their corresponding labor force participation rate was 64.4 percent, and their unemployment rate was 4.4 percent.

- An examination of the differences between refugee households receiving cash assistance and those not receiving cash assistance highlights the difficulties facing refugees in becoming economically self-sufficient. First, cash assistance recipient households are notably larger than non-recipient households with a greater proportion of dependent children. Second, members of such households are less likely to have strong competence in English.

- The survey data again emphasized that while refugees face significant problems on arrival in the United States, over time refugees increasingly seek and find jobs, moving toward self-sufficiency in their new country. After three years of residence in the U.S., refugees have a labor force participation rate similar to that of the general U.S. population, and an unemployment rate that, at 9 percent, is only slightly above the national average.

- Based on data from the Internal Revenue Service, median incomes of refugees remained below those of other residents in the U.S. However, an upward trend provides a basis for optimism about future incomes.

## Refugee Adjustment of Status

- In FY 1984, approximately 75,000 refugees adjusted their immigration status to that of permanent resident alien.

## PART IV

Part IV discusses the plans of the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement to improve the refugee program. The Director highlights activities undertaken by ORR in FY 1984 and activities planned for FY 1985 to improve refugees' prospects for self-sufficiency and social adjustment, strengthen the overseas medical screening program and improve domestic followup, and respond to the problem of refugee resettlement into communities least able to provide for the employment and social needs of refugees.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION.................................................. 1

II. REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM.................................. 4
  ADMISSIONS.................................................... 4
    Arrivals and Countries of Origin............................ 7
  RECEPTION AND PLACEMENT ACTIVITIES............................ 15
    The Cooperative Agreements.................................. 15
    Evaluation and Monitoring of Reception and Placement Activities................ 16
    Other Reception and Placement Activities.................... 17
  DOMESTIC RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM................................. 18
    Refugee Appropriations...................................... 18
    State-Administered Program.................................. 24
      o Overview................................................ 24
      o Cash and Medical Assistance............................. 26
      o Social Services......................................... 34
      o Targeted Assistance..................................... 36
      o Unaccompanied Refugee Children.......................... 38
      o Program Monitoring...................................... 40
    Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program..................... 48
    Refugee Health.............................................. 50
    Refugee Education........................................... 52
    National Discretionary Projects............................. 54
    Program Evaluation.......................................... 66
    Data and Data System Development............................ 75
  KEY FEDERAL ACTIVITIES........................................ 77

III. REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES................................ 78
  POPULATION PROFILE............................................ 78
    Nationality, Age, and Sex................................... 78
    Geographic Location and Movement............................ 81
  ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT........................................... 88
    Overview.................................................... 88
    Current Employment Status of Southeast Asian Refugees......................... 89
    Factors Affecting Employment Status......................... 93
    Achieving Economic Self-Sufficiency......................... 95
    Incomes of Southeast Asian Refugees.............................................101
  REFUGEE ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS AND CITIZENSHIP..................103
    Adjustment of Status........................................103
    Citizenship.................................................107

IV. REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT IN PERSPECTIVE...........................109

Page

APPENDIX A: Tables

Table 1: Southeast Asian Refugee Arrivals in the United States: 1975 through September 30, 1984 ............ A-1

Table 2: Refugee Arrivals in the United States by Month: FY 1984 ............................................... A-2

Table 3: Southeast Asian Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1984 ........................ A-3

Table 4: Eastern European and Soviet Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1984 ............. A-5

Table 5: Ethiopian and Near Eastern Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1984 .......... A-7

Table 6: Total Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1984 ............................... A-9

Table 7: Applications for Refugee Status Granted by INS: FY 1980 - FY 1984 .................................. A-11

Table 8: Persons Approved for Asylum from Selected Nations: FY 1980 - FY 1984 .................................. A-12

Table 9: Estimated Southeast Asian Refugee Population by State: September 30, 1983, and September 30, 1984 .. A-14

Table 10: Secondary Migration Data Compiled from the Refugee State-of-Origin Report: June 30, 1984 .............. A-16

Table 11: Receipt of Cash Assistance by Refugee Nationality: June 30, 1984 ........................................... A-18

Table 12: List of Twelve States with Largest School Enrollment of Refugee Children: March 1984 ..................... A-20

Table 13: Placement and Status of Southeast Asian Unaccompanied Minor Refugees by State and Sponsoring Agency: September 1984 ....................................... A-21

Page

APPENDIX B: Federal Agency Reports

Bureau for Refugee Programs, Department of State ......... B-1
Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice ........ B-6
Office of Bilingual Education, Department of Education ........ B-8
Public Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services ........ B-11

APPENDIX C: Resettlement Agency Reports

American Council for Nationalities Service ........ C-1
American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc. ........ C-6
Buddhist Council for Refugee Rescue and Resettlement ..... C-11
Church World Service ........ C-15
HIAS, Inc. ........ C-18
Idaho Voluntary Resettlement Agency ........ C-24
International Rescue Committee, Inc. ........ C-26
Iowa Refugee Service Center ........ C-31
Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service ........ C-33
Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee, Inc. ........ C-39
Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief ........ C-43
Tolstoy Foundation, Inc. ........ C-51
United States Catholic Conference ........ C-56
World Relief ........ C-58

APPENDIX D: State Refugee Coordinators ........ D-1

APPENDIX E: Refugee Health Project Grants ........ E-1

# I. INTRODUCTION

Section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980 requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, to submit a report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program not later than January 31 following the end of each fiscal year. The Refugee Act requires that the report contain:

- an updated profile of the employment and labor force statistics for refugees who have entered the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act since May 1975 (Part III, pp. 88-102 of the report);
- a description of the extent to which refugees received the forms of assistance or services under title IV Chapter 2 (entitled "Refugee Assistance") of the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980, since May 1975 (Part II, pp. 18-53);
- a description of the geographic location of refugees (Part II, pp. 7-14 and Part III, pp. 81-87);
- a summary of the results of the monitoring and evaluation of the programs administered by the Department of Health and Human Services (Part II, pp. 40-47 and 66-74) and by the Department of State (which awards grants to national resettlement agencies for initial resettlement of refugees in the United States) during the fiscal year for which the report is submitted (Part II, pp. 15-17);

- a description of the activities, expenditures, and policies of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) and of the activities of States, voluntary resettlement agencies, and sponsors (Part II, pp. 18-76, and Appendices C, D, E,);
- the plans of the Director of ORR for improvement of refugee resettlement (Part IV, pp. 109-117);
- evaluations of the extent to which the services provided under title IV Chapter 2 are assisting refugees in achieving economic self-sufficiency, obtaining skills in English, and achieving employment commensurate with their skills and abilities (Part II, pp. 26-37 and, Part III, pp. 88-102);
- any fraud, abuse, or mismanagement which has been reported in the provision of services or assistance (Part II, pp. 45-47);
- a description of any assistance provided by the Director of ORR pursuant to Section 412(e)(5) (Part II, p. 27);*
- a summary of the location and status of unaccompanied refugee children admitted to the U.S. (Part II, pp. 38-39); and

---

* Section 412(e)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act authorizes the ORR Director to "allow for the provision of medical assistance... to any refugee, during the one-year period after entry, who does not qualify for assistance under a State plan approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act on account of any resources or income requirement of such plan, but only if the Director determines that --

> "(A) this will (i) encourage economic self-sufficiency, or (ii) avoid a significant burden on State and local governments; and
> "(B) the refugee meets such alternative financial resources and income requirements as the Director shall establish."

- a summary of the information compiled and evaluation made under Section 412(a)(8) whereby the Attorney General provides the Director of ORR information supplied by refugees when they apply for adjustment of status (Part III, pp. 103-107).

In response to the reporting requirements listed above, refugee program developments from October 1, 1983, until September 30, 1984, are described in Parts II and III. Part IV looks beyond FY 1984 in discussing the plans of the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement to improve refugee resettlement and program initiatives which continue into FY 1985. This report is the fifth prepared in accordance with the Refugee Act of 1980 -- and the eighteenth in a series of reports to Congress on Refugee Resettlement in the United States since 1975.

## II. REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

### ADMISSIONS

The Refugee Act of 1980 defines the term "refugee" and establishes the framework for selecting refugees for admission to the United States.* In accordance with the Act, the President determines the number of refugees to be admitted to the U.S. during each fiscal year after consultations are held between Executive Branch officials and the Congress prior to the new fiscal year. The Act also gives the President authority to respond to unforeseen emergency refugee situations.

---

* Section 101(a)(42) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980 defines the term "refugee" to mean:

"(A) any person who is outside any country of such person's nationality or, in the case of a person having no nationality, is outside any country in which such person last habitually resided, and who is unable or unwilling to return to, and unable or unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion, or

"(B) in such special circumstances as the President, after appropriate consultation (as defined in section 207(e) of this Act) may specify, any person who is within the country of such person's nationality or, in the case of a person having no nationality, within the country in which such person is habitually residing, and who is persecuted or who has a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. The term 'refugee' does not include any person who ordered, incited, assisted, or othewise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality membership in a particular social group, or political opinion."

As part of the consultation process for FY 1984, President Reagan established a ceiling of 72,000 refugees. Approximately 70,600 actually entered the United States during that period.

Applicants for refugee admission into the United States must meet all of the following criteria:

-- The applicant must meet the definition of a refugee in the Refugee Act of 1980.

-- The applicant must be among the types of refugees determined during the consultation process to be of special humanitarian concern to the United States.

-- The applicant must be admissible under United States law.

-- The applicant must not be firmly resettled in any foreign country. (In some situations, the availability of resettlement elsewhere may also preclude the processing of applicants.)

Although a refugee may meet the above criteria, the existence of the U.S. refugee admissions program does not create an entitlement to enter the United States. The annual admissions program is a legal mechanism for admitting an applicant who is among those persons for whom the United States has a special concern, is eligible under one of those priorities applicable to his/her situation, and meets the definition of a refugee under the Act, as determined by an officer of the Immigration and

Naturalization Service. The need for resettlement, not the desire of a refugee to enter the United States, is a governing principle in the management of the United States refugee admissions program.

This section contains information on refugees who entered the United States and on persons granted asylum in the United States during FY 1984.* Particular attention is given to States of initial resettlement and to trends in refugee admissions. All tables referenced by number are located in Appendix A.

---

* The procedure for granting asylum to aliens is authorized in section 208(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act: "The Attorney General shall establish a procedure for an alien physically present in the United States or at a land border or port of entry, irrespective of such alien's status, to apply for asylum, and the alien may be granted asylum in the discretion of the Attorney General if the Attorney General determines that such alien is a refugee within the meaning of section 101(a)(42)(A)".

## Arrivals and Countries of Origin

In FY 1984, nearly 71,000 refugees entered the United States, as compared with 61,000 in FY 1983. This represents an increase of 16 percent. Of the total refugee arrivals in FY 1984, 74 percent were from East Asia, 15 percent were from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, 7 percent were from the Near East/South Asia, 4 percent were from Africa, and less than 1 percent were from Latin America and the Caribbean. The proportion from East Asia rose from 65 percent in FY 1983, while the proportion from each of the other areas fell slightly. However, in terms of absolute numbers, admissions from areas other than East Asia were roughly comparable in 1984 to their 1983 levels.

During FY 1984, 11,627 persons were granted asylum in the United States. This represents an increase of 369 percent as compared with 2,479 successful asylum applicants in FY 1983, and it exceeds the combined total of all asylum applications granted from 1980 through 1983.

### o Southeast Asian Refugees

In FY 1984, 52,000 Southeast Asian refugees arrived in the United States, meeting the admissions ceiling of 52,000 previously established. This represents a 33-percent increase over the 39,167 refugees admitted from Southeast Asia during FY 1983. Since the spring of 1975, the United States has admitted 711,001 refugees from Southeast Asia as of September 30, 1984 (Appendix A, Table 1). Monthly arrivals during FY 1984 averaged approximately 4,300, with a rather stable flow being maintained during the year (Table 2).

Most States received more Southeast Asian refugees in FY 1984 than in FY 1983, in keeping with the overall increase in arrivals. In seven of the smaller States, arrival figures declined. The proportional share of refugees resettled in each State was similar to that established in earlier years, since family reunifications account for the majority of current placements. California continued to lead the list of States receiving the most refugees, with more than 16,000 arrivals, 32.1 percent of the total.

In FY 1984, Georgia appeared for the first time on the list of the ten States receiving the most new Southeast Asian arrivals during the fiscal year. The top nine States remained the same as in FY 1981 through FY 1983, with small shifts in rank. The proportion of refugees placed in the top ten States was 69.6 percent in FY 1984 as compared with 68.8 percent in FY 1983. The top ten States in terms of Southeast Asian refugee arrivals during FY 1984 are listed below:

| State | Number of New Southeast Asian Refugees | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| California | 16,718 | 32.1% |
| Texas | 4,510 | 8.7 |
| Washington | 2,643 | 5.1 |
| Massachusetts | 2,282 | 4.4 |
| New York | 2,130 | 4.1 |
| Illinois | 1,851 | 3.6 |
| Pennsylvania | 1,656 | 3.2 |
| Minnesota | 1,633 | 3.1 |
| Virginia | 1,564 | 3.0 |
| Georgia | 1,138 | 2.2 |
| TOTAL | 36,125 | 69.5 |
| Other States | 15,875 | 30.5 |
| TOTAL | 52,000 | 100.0% |

As in the past, Texas continued to be the State with the second highest number of new refugee arrivals from Southeast Asia, with approximately 9 percent of the total. The State of Washington, which ranked third as a resettlement site from the late 1970s through 1981, regained third place in FY 1984. Massachusetts and New York rounded out the list of the top five States, with more than 2,000 refugee placements each.

In past years Oregon has often been one of the top ten States in Southeast Asian refugee arrivals, and it occupied eleventh place in FY 1984, with just under 1,000 arrivals. Arizona had occupied tenth place in FY 1983 through its participation in the Favorable Alternate Sites Project. While it continued to accept significant numbers under this project in FY 1984, overall project arrivals declined, and Arizona ranked nineteenth in FY 1984.

In FY 1984 the proportion of refugee arrivals from Vietnam dropped to less than half of the arriving Southeast Asians, at 48 percent, compared with 59 percent in FY 1983. The proportion from Cambodia increased again, to 38 percent in FY 1984 from 34 percent in FY 1983, while the share of refugees from Laos increased to 14 percent from 7 percent in FY 1983. Vietnamese refugees were the majority group among the new Southeast Asian arrivals in most States during FY 1984. However, nineteen States received more Cambodians than Vietnamese, and the majority of the refugees placed in Wisconsin were from Laos. While California and Texas occupied first and second place, respectively, as resettlement sites for each of the three nationality groups, resettlement patterns by ethnicity diverged below that level. For example, Minnesota was the third most popular State of resettlement for refugees from Laos.

As in previous years, the arriving Southeast Asian refugee population can be described demographically as young. The median age of the arriving Vietnamese refugees was 20.0 years at the time of arrival, while the refugees from Cambodia and Laos were only 17.7 and 18.0 years of age respectively. Twenty-eight percent of the Cambodians and one-third of the Lao and Vietnamese were children of school age. Additionally, 22 percent of the Cambodians and 17 percent of the Lao were preschool-age children, while 8 percent of the Vietnamese were in this age group. About 2 percent of the Southeast Asians were age 65 or older. Numbers of males and females were about equal in the entering Cambodian and Lao populations, but among the Vietnamese, 60 percent of the arriving refugees were males. Vietnamese males outnumbered females by more than two to one in the age group between 12 and 24.

### o Eastern European and Soviet Refugees

The number of refugees arriving from the Soviet Union declined for the fourth straight year, as the Soviet government continued to restrict emigration. Approximately 700 Soviet refugees arrived in the U.S. in FY 1984, compared with twice that number in FY 1983 and more than 20,000 yearly in 1979 and 1980. Since 1975, more than 100,000 Soviet refugees have been resettled in the United States.

As in past years, New York was the most common destination for Soviet refugees, with 47 percent of the total placements, up from 38 percent in FY 1983. California was second with 25 percent, followed by Massachusetts (5 percent) and Illinois (4 percent). This geographic distribution continues the pattern of previous years. A complete listing by State of the resettlement sites of Soviet and Eastern European refugees appears in Table 4.

Refugees from the Soviet Union are the oldest of the arriving nationality groups, with a median age at the time of arrival of 43.1 among the FY 1984 arrivals. Women slightly outnumbered men with 53 percent of the total, and their median age was significantly higher, at 49.7 compared with 38.3 for the men. Only about 11 percent of the Soviets were children of school age, while more than 20 percent were age 65 or older.

During FY 1984, the number of refugees from Eastern Europe was approximately 10,000, a small decline from the 11,000 resettled in FY 1983. The majority arrived from Romania, with about 4,200, and Poland with 3,900, with smaller numbers from Czechoslovakia (800), Hungary (500) and other countries. The number of refugees from Eastern Europe resettled since 1975 now totals about 56,000.

New York and California, in almost equal numbers, receive the most Eastern European refugees. Together these States resettled about 41 percent of the refugees from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania who arrived in FY 1984. Other States that received significant numbers in FY 1984 were Illinois (particularly Poles and Romanians), Texas (Poles and Romanians), Michigan (Poles and Romanians), Connecticut (Poles), and New Jersey (Poles). Table 4 contains a complete listing by State of the numbers resettled of these four nationality groups.

In age-sex structure, the refugees arriving in FY 1984 from these four Eastern European countries are rather similar to each other, but different from the Soviets. Their median ages range from 26 to 29, with only small differences in age distribution between men and women. On average, the men are one or two years older. Between 16 and 23 percent are children of school age at the time of entry. Only a few are over age 65, except for Romanians, with 2.5 percent over age 65. More than 60 percent of the refugees from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland are males, while the Romanians are divided equally between males and females.

- Latin American Refugees

Sixty-nine Cuban refugees arrived in the United States in FY 1984, the smallest annual total in many years. Since 1959, more than 800,000 Cuban refugees have been admitted to the U.S. (None of these figures includes the 125,000 Cuban "entrants" who arrived during the 1980 boatlift.) The majority of the arriving Cuban refugees in FY 1984 settled in Florida. New Jersey, California, Illinois, and New York absorbed most of the rest.

From El Salvador 91 persons were admitted in legal refugee status in FY 1984, the first year in which Salvadorans were given this status under the Refugee Act of 1980. The majority of them were resettled in California (31 percent), Illinois (24 percent), and New York (16 percent).

- Ethiopian Refugees

Almost all of the refugees arriving from Africa are Ethiopians. In FY 1984 about 2,500 Ethiopians arrived with refugee status, which represents a level comparable to that of FY 1983. They were more widely dispersed about the U.S. than are most refugee groups. The largest number settled in California, which received 18 percent. Significant numbers also settled in Texas (13 percent), New York (7 percent), and the Washington, D.C., area. Table 5 contains a complete listing of the States of arrival of this group.

On average, the Ethiopian refugees are younger than those from Eastern Europe but older than those from Southeast Asia. The median age of those arriving in FY 1984 was 23.4 years; men averaged 24.6 years while the average age of the women was 20.8 years. Sixty-seven percent of the arriving Ethiopians were men.

o Near Eastern Refugees

Iran accounted for the largest number of refugees arriving from the Near East during FY 1984, with about 2,800 arrivals. Approximately 2,000 refugees arrived from Afghanistan and about 160 from Iraq. The total number of refugees arriving from the Near East was slightly less in FY 1984 than in FY 1983 and FY 1982, but higher than the levels seen in the 1980-81 period. More refugees arrived from Iran than in any previous year, but the number from Afghanistan fell by about 30 percent and from Iraq by nearly 90 percent.

California was the most common destination for refugees arriving from the Near East: 33 percent of the Afghans and 45 percent of the Iranians settled there. The most common destinations for refugees from Iraq were Michigan, where 39 percent of the Iraqis were placed, and Illinois, which received 29 percent of the Iraqis. New York was the second most frequent State of placement for refugees from Afghanistan and Iran. Afghans also settled in Virginia and Iranians in Texas in significant numbers. Table 5 contains a complete tabulation by State of the initial resettlement locations of these three groups.

The refugees arriving from the Near East during FY 1984 were relatively young, although older on average than the Southeast Asians. The median age of both Afghans and Iraqis was about 22, and the ages of the men and women in these groups did not differ greatly. The Iranian refugees were slightly older on average, with a median age of 25.9. Approximately 25 percent of the Afghans were children of school age, while the comparable figure was between 15 and 19 percent for the Iranians and Iraqis. About 2 percent of the Near Eastern refugees were over age 65. Men outnumbered women in all groups, but the sex ratio was fairly even in the Afghan population, which was 55 percent male, while 62 percent of the arriving Iranian refugees were men.

- o Other Refugees and Asylees

During FY 1984, the number of applications for refugee status granted worldwide by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) increased to 77,932 from the FY 1983 total of 73,645. The increase in the number of approved applications stemmed from relatively modest increases for a number of countries; the overall pattern of approvals in FY 1984 was very similar to that of FY 1983. Table 7 contains a tabulation of applications for refugee status granted by INS, by country of chargeability, under the Refugee Act of 1980 for each year from 1980 through 1984.

INS approved claims for political asylum status from 11,627 persons in FY 1984--more than had been approved in the four previous years combined. A complete listing of the countries from which persons came who were granted asylum during each year from FY 1980 through FY 1984 is shown in Table 8. Sixty-four percent of all favorable asylum rulings in FY 1984 were granted to Iranians. More than 1,000 Nicaraguans and slightly fewer than 1,000 Poles were also given political asylum. Other countries from which significant numbers of asylees came were El Salvador, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, and Romania.

## RECEPTION AND PLACEMENT ACTIVITIES

In FY 1983, twelve private voluntary resettlement agencies and two State agencies were responsible for the reception and initial placement of refugees in the United States through cooperative agreements with the Bureau for Refugee Programs in the Department of State. Agencies received $390 for each refugee they assisted from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and $560 for each other refugee they assisted. Program participation was based on the submission of an acceptable proposal.

### The Cooperative Agreements

The cooperative agreements outline the core services which the agencies are responsible for providing to the refugees, either by the agencies themselves or by other individuals or organizations who work with the agencies. The core services include:

> Pre-arrival -- identification of individuals outside of the agency who may assist in the sponsorship process, orientation of such individuals, and development of arrangements for the refugee's travel to his or her final destination;
>
> Reception -- assistance in obtaining initial housing, furnishings, food, and clothing; and
>
> Counseling and referral -- orientation of the refugee to the community, specifically in the areas of health, employment, and training with the primary goal of refugee self-sufficiency at the earliest possible date.

Under the agreement, the resettlement agencies were also expected to consult with public agencies in order to plan together an appropriate program of refugee resettlement.

In FY 1984, the cooperative agreements were modified to require that refugees not access publicly-funded cash assistance for a minimum 30-day period, and that special services be provided to children traveling without their parents.

## Evaluation and Monitoring of Reception and Placement Activities

In late FY 1982, the Bureau for Refugee Programs created the Office of Reception and Placement, whose primary responsibility is to work with the private voluntary agencies. Toward the end of FY 1982, the Office commenced a systematic monitoring of agencies' performance under the terms of the agreement by reviewing reception and placement activities in Arlington, Virginia.

In FY 1984, the monitoring program included in-depth reviews of these activities in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Tampa/St. Petersburg, Florida; South Carolina; Providence, Rhode Island; and Portland, Oregon. A site visit to the unaccompanied minors program in Michigan was also conducted jointly with ORR. As a result of the Bureau's monitoring, strengths and weaknesses of agencies' programs have been identified and, where needed, corrective action recommended. A followup visit, approximately nine to twelve months after the initial review, is an important component of the monitoring process. Followup visits to New York City and Houston, Texas, initially reviewed in FY 1983, were conducted in FY 1984. The cooperative agreement which, along with an agency's accepted proposal, governs reception and placement program activities, has been modified to reflect Bureau monitoring results.

Other Bureau management activities with domestic program implications included:

- Representation at weekly allocations meetings of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies (ACVA) to follow placement policy implementation, to assist in providing sponsorship arrangements for refugees overseas, and to exchange information;
- Review of data on actual refugee placements to ensure sensitivity to impacted areas;
- Monthly validation of claims of newly arriving refugees; and
- Quarterly review of agencies' financial data.

## Other Reception and Placement Activities

During FY 1984, the Bureau funded a demonstration project proposed by five voluntary agencies which maintain reception and placement programs in the Chicago area. The basic outline of the voluntary agencies' project is to provide integrated reception and placement, case management, and employment services to arriving refugees for a minimum six-month period while also providing cash and medical support to refugees, obviating their need to access public assistance programs. The goal of the project is to assist refugees in attaining self-sufficiency at an early date through an intensive service delivery program. The project will continue into FY 1985.

## DOMESTIC RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

### Refugee Appropriations

In FY 1984, the refugee domestic assistance program functioned under the authority of the Second Continuing Resolution (P.L. 98-151) enacted on November 14, 1983. The total funding which HHS received for the program for FY 1984 was $541.9 million.

Of that amount, $357.1 million was used to reimburse States for the cost of providing direct cash and medical assistance to eligible refugees, for aid to unaccompanied refugee children, and for the supplementary payments States made to refugees who qualified for Supplemental Security Income (SSI). States were also reimbursed for their share of State and local welfare agency administrative costs.

Almost $67 million was awarded to help States provide refugees with English language training, vocational training, and other social services, the purpose of which is to promote economic self-sufficiency and discourage refugee dependence on public assistance programs. States also received $3.3 million to utilize refugee Mutual Assistance Associations (MAAs) as qualified providers of social services to refugees and to strengthen their service delivery capacity.

In FY 1984, within the scope of the National Discretionary Funds Program, ORR awarded $2.2 million to finance a variety of national demonstration projects and special projects. These included activities in the areas of employment, English language training, vocational training, health, mental health, business and economic development, and the placement of refugees away from impacted communities.

As in the two previous years, ORR continued to fund a targeted assistance program in FY 1984 with awards to States and funding of special projects totaling $37.5 million. The objective of this program is to assist refugee/entrant populations in heavily concentrated areas of resettlement where State, local, and private resources have proved insufficient. In FY 1984, States received $23.8 million for refugee and entrant targeted assistance projects, and $2.7 million for three major initiatives: (1) To increase the number of wage earners in refugee and entrant households; (2) to provide enhanced skills training, job placement, and followup assistance for employment and self-employment of targeted refugee and entrant populations; and (3) to assist Highland Lao/Hmong refugees in attaining self-sufficiency. Also, $6 million was targeted for health care to qualified entrants in Florida, and $5 million was made available to the Dade County, Florida, school district which was heavily impacted by entrant children.*

Under the matching grant program, $4 million was obligated in FY 1984 to provide national voluntary resettlement agencies with matching Federal funds for assistance and services in resettling Soviet and other refugees. Funding was provided in lieu of the regular State-administered cash and medical assistance and social services.

Health screening and followup services for refugees amounted to $8.4 million in FY 1984. Funds were used to staff Centers for Disease Control (CDC) stations overseas and at ports-of-entry to inspect refugees, review medical records, and notify State and local health departments about conditions requiring followup medical care.

---

* Although only $37.5 million was awarded in FY 1984, the 1984 targeted assistance (TA) budget was $77.5 million and the remaining funds in the account will be available for obligation in FY 1985. These funds are in addition to any TA funds available in the FY 1985 refugee appropriation.

In the area of education assistance to refugee children, ORR made available $16.6 million to the Department of Education via an interagency agreement. The funds were to help the schools develop special curricula, fund bilingual teachers and aides, and provide guidance and counseling required to bring these children into the mainstream of the American educational system.

Finally, to provide program direction, monitoring, and technical assistance to States and the voluntary agencies which administer Federal funds and to manage the entire refugee and entrant domestic assistance program, ORR incurred direct Federal administrative costs of $5.8 million.

## ORR Budget Authority and Obligations of Refugee Assistance Funds: FY 1984

(Amounts in $000)

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Refugee Resettlement Program | |
| 1. State-Administered Program: | |
| a. Cash Assistance, Medical Assistance, State Administration, Unaccompanied Minors, and SSI | $ 357,127 |
| b. Social Services | 66,972 |
| Subtotal, State-Administered Program | 424,099 |
| 2. MAA Incentive Grant Program | 3,279 |
| 3. Demonstration Projects and Special Projects | 2,213 |
| 4. Targeted Assistance: | |
| a. Refugees & Entrants | 23,844 |
| b. Multiple Wage-Earners | 648 |
| c. Training Enhancement | 1,800 |
| d. Highland Lao/Hmong Initiatives | 238 |
| e. Health Care for Entrants | 6,000 |
| f. Education -- Entrant Children | 5,000 |
| Subtotal, Targeted Assistance | 37,530 |
| Total, Refugee Resettlement Program | 467,121 |
| B. Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program | 4,000 |
| C. Preventive Health: Screening and Health Services | 8,400 |
| D. Education Assistance for Children | 16,600 |
| E. Federal Administration | 5,812 |
| Total, Refugee Program Obligations | 501,933 |
| Targeted Assistance Funds remaining available for obligation through September 30, 1985 | 39,026 |
| Lapsing Funds | 938 |
| Total, Refugee Program Budget Authority | $541,897 |

## CMA*, Social Services, and Targeted Assistance Obligations: FY 1984 Funds

| State | CMA | Social Services | MAA Incentive | Targeted Assistance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | $ 282,000 | $ 230,770 | $ 11,539 | $ |
| Arizona | 1,981,000 | 490,696 | 35,000 | |
| Arkansas | 120,000 | 218,266 | 10,922 | |
| California | 176,670,881 | 19,191,049 | 959,825 | 24,654,622 |
| Colorado | 2,900,000 | 945,881 | 47,306 | 500,518 |
| Connecticut | 2,950,000 | 748,577 | 37,431 | |
| Delaware | 40,000 | 75,000 | -- | |
| Dist. of Columbia | 1,100,000 | 381,552 | 75,000 | 54,738 |
| Florida | 7,000,000 | 8,740,665 | 185,906 | 15,897,951 |
| Georgia | 1,680,000 | 954,339 | 72,072 | |
| Hawaii | 2,919,000 | 467,065 | 20,071 | 551,152 |
| Idaho | 489,000 | 135,248 | 5,874 | |
| Illinois | 15,500,000 | 2,398,352 | 119,962 | 2,588,995 |
| Indiana | 280,000 | 285,199 | 14,256 | |
| Iowa | 3,500,000 | 669,342 | 26,755 | |
| Kansas | 2,828,926 | 797,122 | 39,861 | 540,500 |
| Kentucky | 532,000 | 181,529 | 8,755 | |
| Louisiana | 1,780,000 | 868,651 | 43,435 | 421,467 |
| Maine | 700,000 | 165,125 | -- | |
| Maryland | 3,500,000 | 828,617 | 42,246 | 512,735 |
| Massachusetts | 12,800,000 | 1,787,502 | 89,393 | 1,334,658 |
| Michigan | 7,109,800 | 1,047,751 | 52,498 | |
| Minnesota | 11,500,000 | 2,077,621 | 75,000 | 1,571,388 |
| Mississippi | 300,000 | 148,392 | 7,423 | |
| Missouri | 1,700,000 | 603,679 | 30,186 | 316,209 |
| Montana | 550,000 | 90,000 | 5,000 | |
| Nebraska | 610,000 | 189,948 | 9,501 | |
| Nevada | 470,000 | 153,556 | -- | |
| New Hampshire | 550,000 | 75,023 | 5,000 | |
| New Jersey | 4,800,000 | 1,116,700 | 43,030 | 1,253,557 |
| New Mexico | 700,000 | 253,352 | 10,332 | |
| New York | 21,200,000 | 3,383,768 | 169,259 | 2,071,504 |
| North Carolina | 1,004,000 | 443,520 | 22,183 | |
| North Dakota | 750,000 | 118,603 | 5,936 | |
| Ohio | 2,500,000 | 773,217 | 75,000 | |
| Oklahoma | 968,000 | 667,118 | 48,809 | |

---

* Funds for cash assistance, medical assistance, and related State administrative costs, including aid to unaccompanied minors.

| State | CMA | Social Services | MAA Incentive | Targeted Assistance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Oregon | $ 10,006,000 | $ 1,358,879 | $ 74,695 | $ 1,407,416 |
| Pennsylvania | 9,500,000 | 1,836,597 | 91,882 | 963,382 |
| Rhode Island | 2,400,000 | 768,069 | 75,000 | 688,095 |
| South Carolina | 365,000 | 208,704 | 10,438 | |
| South Dakota | 149,000 | 90,000 | 20,000 | |
| Tennessee | 528,000 | 486,915 | 24,348 | |
| Texas | 7,220,000 | 4,481,120 | 217,459 | 1,129,253 |
| Utah | 3,000,000 | 664,871 | 66,900 | 343,292 |
| Vermont | 500,000 | 75,000 | 5,000 | |
| Virginia | 8,700,000 | 1,980,024 | 99,021 | 1,312,230 |
| Washington | 16,987,700 | 2,288,944 | 114,585 | 2,079,872 |
| West Virginia | 45,000 | 75,000 | -- | |
| Wisconsin | 3,400,000 | 878,749 | 75,000 | |
| Wyoming | 62,000 | 75,000 | -- | |
| TOTAL | $357,127,307 | $66,971,667 | $3,279,094 | $60,193,534* |

---

* These are the amounts allocated from the FY 1984 funds which were authorized to be obligated over a 2-year period. In FY 1984 $23,844,423 was awarded, and $36,349,111 will be awarded in FY 1985.

## State-Administered Program

- Overview

Federal resettlement assistance to refugees is provided by ORR primarily through a State-administered refugee resettlement program. Refugees who meet INS status requirements and who possess appropriate INS documentation, regardless of national origin, may be eligible for assistance under the State-administered refugee resettlement program, and most refugees receive such assistance. Soviet and certain other refugees, while not excluded from the State-administered program, currently are provided resettlement assistance primarily through an alternative system of ORR matching grants to private resettlement agencies for similar purposes.

Under the Refugee Act of 1980, States have key responsibilities in planning, administering, and coordinating refugee resettlement activities. States administer the provision of cash and medical assistance and social services to refugees as well as maintaining legal responsibility for the care of unaccompanied refugee children in the State.

In order to receive assistance under the refugee program, a State is required by the Refugee Act and by regulation to submit a plan which describes the nature and scope of the program and gives assurances that the program will be administered in conformity with the Act. As a part of the plan, a State designates a State agency to be responsible for developing and administering the plan and names a refugee coordinator who will ensure the coordination of public and private refugee resettlement resources in the State.

ORR Regional Offices examined State Plan documents during FY 1983 to identify areas of deficiency. The resulting assessments were used to guide the States in amending or modifying their State plans during FY 1984.

This section describes further the components of the State-administered program -- cash and medical assistance, social services, targeted assistance, and aid to unaccompanied refugee children -- and then discusses efforts initiated within ORR to monitor these activities.

o Cash and Medical Assistance

Many working age refugees from all parts of the world are able to find employment soon after arrival in their new communities. For those who require services before taking jobs, a delay in employment may occur, during which time adequate financial support may be available through the local resettlement agency. Many refugees, however, need additional time, assistance, and training in order to be placed in a job, and the resettlement agencies are for the most part unable to fund longer term maintenance.

Refugees who are members of families with dependent children may qualify for and receive benefits under the program of aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) on the same basis as citizens. Under the refugee program, the Federal Government (ORR) reimburses States for their share of AFDC payments made to refugees during the first 36 months following their initial entry into the United States. Similarly, aged, blind, and disabled refugees may be eligible for the Federal supplemental security income (SSI) program on the same basis as citizens. In States which supplement the Federal SSI payment levels, ORR bears the cost of such State supplements paid to refugees during their first 36 months. Needy refugees also are eligible to receive food stamps on the same basis as non-refugees. Refugees who qualify for Medicaid according to all applicable eligibility criteria receive medical services under that program. The State share of Medicaid costs incurred on a refugee's behalf during his or her initial 36 months in this country is reimbursed by ORR.

Needy refugees who do not qualify for cash assistance under the AFDC or SSI programs may receive special cash assistance for refugees -- termed "refugee cash assistance" (RCA) -- according to their need. In order to receive such cash assistance, refugee individuals or families must meet the income and resource eligibility standards applied in the AFDC program in the State. This assistance is available for up to 18 months after the refugee arrives in the U.S.

In all States, refugees who are eligible for RCA are also eligible for refugee medical assistance (RMA) for up to 18 months. This assistance is provided in the same manner as Medicaid is for other needy residents. Refugees may also be eligible for only medical assistance, if their income is slightly above that required for cash assistance eligibility and if they incur medical expenses which bring their net income down to the Medicaid eligibility level.*

---

* Section 412(e)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act authorizes the Director of ORR to "allow for the provision of medical assistance...to any refugee, during the one-year period after entry, who does not qualify for assistance under a State plan approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act on account of any resources or income requirement of such plan, but only if the Director determines that--

> "(A) this will (i) encourage self-sufficiency, or (ii) avoid a significant burden on State and local governments; and
>
> "(B) the refugee meets such alternative financial resources and income requirements as the Director shall establish."

In FY 1984, as in FY 1983, the Director of ORR utilized this authority to enable Arizona to continue an effective program of refugee medical assistance while the State, which had not previously participated in Medicaid, tests a Medicaid demonstration project.

During the second 18 months of residence in the United States, a refugee who is not eligible for AFDC, SSI, or Medicaid would have to qualify under an existing State or local general assistance (GA) program on the same basis as other residents of the locality in which he or she resides. ORR then reimburses the full costs of this assistance for a refugee's second 18 months of residence in the United States.

Based on information provided by the States in their Quarterly Performance Reports to ORR, 53.9 percent of refugees who had been in the United States three years or less were receiving some form of cash assistance at the end of FY 1984. This compares with a 53.4 percent cash assistance utilization rate for the end of September 1983 -- one year earlier.* The following table shows cash assistance utilization among time-eligible refugees as of September 30, 1984, compared with the same information one year earlier -- in terms of absolute numbers of recipients as well as utilization rates by State.

---

* These percentages are derived from the total U.S. time-eligible refugee population including refugees resettled through the matching grant program.

## Cash Assistance Dependency Among Time-Eligible Refugees: September 30, 1984, and September 30, 1983

| | Total Cash Recipients as of: | | Estimated 36-month Refugee Population as of: | | Dependency Rates (in %) | | Increase/ (Decrease) From 9/30/83 to 9/30/84 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 9/30/84 | 9/30/83 | 9/30/84 | 9/30/83 | 9/30/84 | 9/30/83 | |
| | (Note C) | | (Notes A, B) | | | | |
| Alabama | 248 | 196 | 1,053 | 1,222 | 23.6% | 16.0% | 7.6% |
| Alaska | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Arizona | 129 | 242 | 1,680 | 2,545 | 7.7 | 9.5 | (1.8) |
| Arkansas | 140 | 107 | 467 | 1,025 | 30.0 | 10.4 | 19.6 |
| California | 66,134 | 95,480 | 77,419 | 104,796 | 85.4 | 91.1 | (5.7) |
| Colorado | 701 | 1,141 | 2,751 | 5,135 | 25.5 | 22.2 | 3.3 |
| Connecticut | 623 | 635 | 3,133 | 4,124 | 19.9 | 15.4 | 4.5 |
| Delaware | 11 | 19 | 53 | 75 | 20.8 | 25.3 | (4.5) |
| District of Columbia | 101 | 172 | 981 | 2,048 | 10.3 | 8.4 | 1.9 |
| Florida | 1,199 | 1,834 | 4,322 | 7,483 | 27.7 | 24.5 | 3.2 |
| Georgia | 722 | 771 | 3,615 | 5,166 | 20.0 | 14.9 | 5.1 |
| Hawaii | 875 | 1,362 | 1,088 | 2,181 | 80.4 | 62.5 | 17.9 |
| Idaho | 253 | 116 | 588 | 639 | 43.0 | 18.2 | 24.8 |
| Illinois | 3,456 | 5,422 | 9,914 | 13,475 | 34.9 | 40.2 | (5.3) |
| Indiana | 304 | 568 | 847 | 1,524 | 35.9 | 37.3 | (1.4) |
| Iowa | 527 | 601 | 2,082 | 2,902 | 25.3 | 20.7 | 4.6 |
| Kansas | 1,697 | 2,273 | 3,268 | 4,297 | 51.9 | 52.9 | (1.0) |
| Kentucky | 166 | 214 | 852 | 949 | 19.5 | 22.6 | (3.1) |
| Louisiana | 711 | 971 | 3,484 | 4,584 | 20.4 | 21.2 | (0.8) |
| Maine | 450 | 232 | 915 | 862 | 49.2 | 26.9 | 22.3 |
| Maryland | 1,371 | 1,666 | 3,324 | 4,692 | 41.3 | 35.5 | 5.8 |
| Massachusetts | 6,805 | 7,147 | 9,535 | 10,203 | 71.4 | 70.1 | 1.3 |
| Michigan | 1,458 | 2,555 | 3,957 | 5,724 | 36.9 | 44.6 | (7.7) |
| Minnesota | 3,552 | 5,106 | 5,499 | 7,943 | 64.6 | 64.3 | 0.3 |
| Mississippi | 55 | 171 | 668 | 802 | 8.2 | 21.3 | (13.1) |
| Missouri | 1,003 | 1,342 | 2,136 | 3,156 | 47.0 | 42.5 | 4.5 |
| Montana | 56 | 43 | 134 | 189 | 41.8 | 22.8 | 19.0 |
| Nebraska | 338 | 338 | 703 | 1,036 | 48.1 | 32.6 | 15.5 |
| Nevada | 229 | 132 | 854 | 995 | 26.8 | 13.3 | 13.5 |
| New Hampshire | 39 | 76 | 379 | 400 | 10.3 | 19.0 | (8.7) |
| New Jersey | 1,118 | 1,278 | 3,219 | 4,384 | 34.7 | 29.2 | 5.5 |
| New Mexico | 318 | 433 | 511 | 1,081 | 62.2 | 40.1 | 22.1 |
| New York | 6,186 | 9,126 | 15,859 | 21,526 | 39.0 | 42.4 | (3.4) |
| North Carolina | 204 | 462 | 2,141 | 2,399 | 9.5 | 19.3 | (9.8) |

| | Total Cash Recipients as of: | | Estimated 36-month Refugee Population as of: | | Dependency Rates (in %) | | Increase/ (Decrease) From 9/30/83 to 9/30/84 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 9/30/84 | 9/30/83 | 9/30/84 | 9/30/83 | 9/30/84 | 9/30/83 | |
| | (Note C) | | (Notes A, B) | | | | |
| North Dakota | 80 | 103 | 437 | 630 | 18.3% | 16.4% | 1.9% |
| Ohio | 1,527 | 1,316 | 3,387 | 4,495 | 45.1 | 29.3 | 15.8 |
| Oklahoma | 361 | 446 | 2,310 | 3,522 | 15.6 | 12.7 | 2.9 |
| Oregon | 2,166 | 3,395 | 4,560 | 6,474 | 47.5 | 52.4 | (4.9) |
| Pennsylvania | 4,554 | 5,828 | 8,202 | 10,447 | 55.5 | 55.8 | (0.3) |
| Rhode Island | 819 | 1,051 | 1,452 | 4,164 | 56.4 | 25.2 | 31.2 |
| South Carolina | 79 | 100 | 549 | 1,124 | 14.4 | 8.9 | 5.5 |
| South Dakota | 52 | 72 | 402 | 432 | 12.9 | 16.7 | (3.8) |
| Tennessee | 452 | 316 | 2,209 | 2,448 | 20.5 | 12.9 | 7.6 |
| Texas | 2,985 | 3,372 | 16,260 | 23,076 | 18.4 | 14.6 | 3.8 |
| Utah | 740 | 820 | 2,450 | 3,589 | 30.2 | 22.9 | 7.3 |
| Vermont | 84 | 62 | 245 | 240 | 34.3 | 25.8 | 8.5 |
| Virginia | 2,332 | 3,250 | 7,533 | 10,634 | 31.0 | 30.6 | 0.4 |
| Washington | 5,164 | 5,572 | 9,317 | 12,386 | 55.4 | 45.0 | 10.4 |
| West Virginia | 6 | 31 | 96 | 190 | 6.3 | 16.3 | (10.0) |
| Wisconsin | 723 | 1,228 | 2,028 | 3,226 | 35.7 | 38.1 | (2.4) |
| Wyoming | 6 | 19 | 50 | 95 | 12.0 | 20.0 | (8.0) |
| Guam | 15 | 10 | 48 | 55 | 31.3 | 18.2 | 13.1 |
| Total U.S. | 123,324 | 169,222 | 228,966 | 316,853 | 53.9% | 53.4% | 0.5% |

**NOTES:**

A. Base population estimates include all refugees resettled in the prior three fiscal years, including refugees resettled under the matching grant program, but exclude Cuban and Haitian entrants. State estimates include adjustments for secondary migration based on the best available data; though the estimates are shown to the last digit, they must be considered approximate. At the national level, secondary migration is not a factor and the time-eligible population is an actual count.

B. The total 36-month refugee population as of 9/30/84 as presented is higher than the actual admissions from overseas by 2,150 refugees. The adjusted population includes revised population counts for Oregon, Washington and Texas based on additional data submitted by these States. The estimated population totals of the other States were not reduced to compensate for these changes.

C. Caseload data are derived from the Quarterly Performance Reports (QPRs) submitted by 49 States (Alaska does not participate in the refugee program), the District of Columbia, and Guam for all time-eligible refugees. Entrants are not included in this report. Except for California, all caseload data only include AFDC, RCA and GA recipients for comparative analysis. The California data include estimated SSI recipients. SSI data, while partially available, are not included because they were not available uniformly on both reporting dates. Based on partial reporting from the States in the September 30, 1983, Quarterly Performance Reports, 4,155 refugees were receiving SSI at the end of FY 1983. All data reported are actual counts unless otherwise indicated.

Use of Cash Assistance by Nationality

The Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982 require ORR to compile and maintain data on the proportion of refugees receiving cash or medical assistance by State of residence and by nationality. In June 1984, the second annual round of data collection took place; States reported on their cash/medical assistance caseloads as of June 30, 1984. Reports cover only the ORR-reimbursable, time-eligible caseload -- i.e., refugees who have been in the U.S. less than three years.

Table 11 (Appendix A) summarizes the findings of the 1984 data collection with all 49 participating States, the District of Columbia, and Guam reporting.* A caseload of 132,107 is covered, including SSI recipients in some States, and this is essentially equal to the total nationwide caseload at that time. Of that caseload, roughly half was reported to be Vietnamese, and Southeast Asians of all nationalities comprised 83 percent. (They are about 75 percent of the time-eligible population.) Soviet and Eastern European refugees comprise less than 8 percent of the reported caseload while they are nearly 15 percent of the population. Other single nationality groups contribute only small fractions to the national caseload.

Dependency rates calculated by nationality range between 20 and 60 percent of time-eligible refugees. These calculations show that the highest dependency is among the Southeast Asians. If dependency is assumed to be distributed in these States in the same proportion as their

---

* Alaska does not participate in the Refugee Resettlement Program.

Southeast Asian arrivals in 1982-84, the best estimates of nationwide dependency rates are about 60 percent for Vietnamese and Lao (including Hmong) and 49 percent for Cambodians.

Among the other nationality groups, the rather high apparent dependency rate of 59 percent for Cubans is thought to be inflated by the reporting of some entrants, who were not included in the population base. Refugees from Eastern Europe (other than Poland), Afghanistan, and Iraq have dependency rates in the low 30-percent range. Refugees from the Soviet Union and Ethiopia show dependency in the high 20-percent range, while refugees from Poland have the lowest dependency rate, at roughly 21 percent.

o Social Services

ORR provides funding for a broad range of social services to refugees, both through States and in some cases through direct service grants. During FY 1984, as in FY 1983, ORR allocated social service funds on a formula basis. Under this formula, about $60 million of the social service funds were allocated directly to States according to their proportion of all refugees who arrived in the United States during the three previous fiscal years and were not resettled under a matching grant program (a description of this resettlement program is included in a later section). Funds were also used to ensure that States with fewer than 500 or 1,000 refugees received a minimum of $75,000 and $100,000 in social service funds, respectively.

Approximately $6.6 million was allocated to States in order to ensure that they ultimately received in FY 1984 no less than the amount originally proposed for social service allocation earlier in the year. Under the final, revised formula, twelve States would have received less than their proposed amount, even though the total available funds increased in the interim. ORR believed that, since the final notice was not published in the Federal Register until the last month of the fiscal year, every State should be protected against a funding reduction below the amount which it had used as a planning figure throughout the fiscal year.

Finally, $3.3 million of available social service funds was allocated to States for the purpose of providing funds to refugee/entrant mutual assistance associations (MAAs) as an incentive to include such organizations as social service providers. The funds were allocated on the same 3-year proportionate population basis as were the regular social service funds. States which chose to receive these optional funds were provided the allocation upon submission of an assurance that the funds would be used for MAAs.

ORR policies allow a variety of relevant services to be provided to refugees in order to facilitate their general adjustment and especially to promote rapid achievement of self-sufficiency. Services which are related directly to the latter goal are particularly emphasized by ORR and are designated as priority services. The priority services are English language training and those services specifically related to employment, such as employment counseling, job placement, and vocational training. Other allowable services include those which are contained in a State's program under title XX of the Social Security Act and certain services identified in ORR policy instructions to the States, such as orientation and translation.

o **Targeted Assistance**

In FY 1984 ORR received a final appropriation of $77.5 million for targeted assistance activities for refugees and entrants. The initial amount available for targeted assistance under the Second Continuing Resolution of 1984 was $81.5 million. However, during consideration of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1984, Congress determined that the continuing need for refugee health screening necessitated the reprogramming of $4.0 million to Preventive Health. (See page 50 for a description of the use of these funds.) At the same time, Congress extended for an additional year ORR's authority to obligate FY 1984 targeted assistance funds, through September 30, 1985. At the end of FY 1984, ORR had obligated approximately $37.5 million, or about half of the total.

By the end of the fiscal year, ORR was engaged in a process of receiving applications from 20 States and the District of Columbia on behalf of 42 qualifying county areas under the formula-based targeted assistance program. As ORR's primary funding mechanism for targeted assistance, this program is designed to enhance and promote innovative employment-related service activities for refugees and entrants who reside in local areas of high need. These areas are defined as counties or contiguous county areas where, because of factors such as unusually large refugee and/or entrant populations, high refugee and/or entrant concentrations in relation to the overall population, and high use of public assistance, there exists a specific need for supplementation of other available service resources for the local refugee and/or entrant population.

The county targeted assistance program for FY 1984 was revised from that implemented in FY 1983 in several major ways: The role of States was enhanced in areas of programmatic as well as fiscal responsibility throughout the period of grant activity. The State application to ORR, rather than containing completed county targeted assistance plans as in the previous year, included a management plan as to how the State would solicit and review county plans and monitor the implementation of county programs. Also, the FY 1984 program allows for up to 15 percent of the available funds to be used for essential services which are not directly related to employment.

The fundamental scope of the county targeted assistance program remains identical to that of FY 1983, and is reflected in the continuation of many of the proven activities developed under that program, such as job development; employment incentives, such as on-site English language training, translation, and worker orientation; on-the-job training; and vocational training.

In addition to the county targeted assistance program, ORR awarded $6 million to Florida for providing health care to eligible entrants, and $5 million to the Dade County public school system in Florida in support of education for entrant children. An additional $2.7 million was used to fund a variety of targeted assistance activities throughout the country, in areas and/or for purposes not addressed under the formula-based program.

o **Unaccompanied Refugee Children**

Children identified in countries of first asylum as unaccompanied minor refugees are resettled through two of the national voluntary resettlement agencies--United States Catholic Conference (USCC) and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS). In most cases, such children are placed in programs operated by affiliates of the national agencies, although in a few States, most notably California, the children are placed in the larger public child welfare system. Legal responsibility for the children is established in such a way that they become eligible for the same range of child welfare services as non-refugee children in the State. Costs incurred on behalf of such children are reimbursed by the Office of Refugee Resettlement until the month after their 18th birthdays or such higher ages as are permitted under the State Plan under title IV-B of the Social Security Act.

Since January 1979, a total of 5,733 children have entered the program. Of these, 679 or 11.8 percent subsequently were reunited with family, and 1,370 or 23.9 percent have been emancipated, having reached the age of majority. The number remaining in the program as of September 30, 1984 was 3,684--an increase of 8.1 percent from the 3,407 in care a year earlier. During FY 1984, 144 children were reunited with family, and 342 were emancipated, according to reports received from the States.

A new USCC program was opened in Alabama, and planning was completed for other new programs in Arizona and Texas. In all, unaccompanied minors are located in 37 States, the District of Columbia, and Guam. New York has the largest number, 771, followed by California with 475, Illinois with 331, and Minnesota with 329. (See Table 13, Appendix A.)

During FY 1984, ORR substantially increased its monitoring activity in the program, carrying out program reviews in several States having large numbers of children. In addition, ORR and the Department of State's Bureau for Refugee Programs jointly carried out a program review in Michigan. Development of a comprehensive monitoring package was completed for implementation in the coming year. ORR continued to provide technical assistance to States, provider agencies, and national voluntary agencies to facilitate program operations.

The anticipated arrival of Amerasian children through the Orderly Departure Program (ODP) from Vietnam prompted ORR, along with voluntary agencies and the Department of State, to focus on the special needs of these children. In FY 1984, 85 Amerasian unaccompanied minor refugees (nearly all teen-agers) arrived through ODP from Vietnam, and were placed in care. ORR also provided technical assistance to the Immigration and Naturalization Service in implementing P.L. 97-359, the so-called Amerasian Children's Act, which is administered by INS.

Reports submitted by the States show that most children continue to make satisfactory progress as they move toward adulthood and emancipation. ORR modified its reporting forms during FY 1984 in order to computerize its records and develop aggregate data on the progress of the children in such areas as English language skills, education, social adjustment, and health.

The ORR program also provides support for 165 unaccompanied minor Cuban and Haitian entrants in seven States in a similar format. During FY 1984, five such children were reunited with family, and 52 were emancipated, having reached the appropriate age in their State of resettlement.

o Program Monitoring

ORR program monitoring activities undertaken during FY 1984 were based on procedures established in FY 1983. Efforts to monitor the State-administered refugee resettlement program focused on four key areas:

-- Program management guidance: To strengthen ORR oversight of State adherence to ORR's regulations, policies, and directives as well as to ORR's goals, priorities, and standards for the purpose of assisting refugees to achieve economic self-sufficiency in the shortest time possible through the delivery of support services.

-- Technical assistance: To improve the quality of State data collection and reporting procedures to achieve completeness and greater consistency of program data related to State assistance and service outcomes, enabling ORR to conduct effective monitoring and comprehensive performance analyses of State program activities.

-- Direct field monitoring/casefile review: To identify strengths and weaknesses in the States' implementation of Federal policies and regulations for the delivery of cash and medical assistance and the administration of refugee funds.

-- Followup: To assist the States to take corrective actions on programmatic aspects of the problems identified in ORR's direct casefile reviews of the State cash/medical assistance program and, if applicable, to recommend a formal audit where the deficiencies in the State system suggest potential overpayment of refugee funds.

The above objectives have been achieved through the implementation of quarterly performance reports by States, casefile reviews, the State Plan amendment process, and followup by ORR when corrective actions were required. The results of ORR program monitoring during FY 1984 are summarized below:

### (a) Program Management Guidance

A revised Statement of Program Goals, Priorities and Standards was issued to all States on March 1, 1984. A key aspect of this statement is the expectation that States will allocate at least 85 percent of social service funds to priority services such as employment services and language training, in keeping with the goals of the Refugee Act of 1980.

Over 30 States with out-of-date State Plans submitted Plan Amendments based on procedures established by ORR to bring State programs into full compliance with ORR regulations and stated priorities. ORR continues to monitor the State implementation of State Plan provisions and funding allocation processes to assure that service priorities as mandated by the Congress are being observed by State Agencies.

National monitoring guidelines were issued to apply ORR monitoring procedures to other components of the program such as targeted assistance and national discretionary funds administered by the States, including the incentive grants program for the refugee mutual assistance associations (MAAs). With the assistance of the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA), ORR also has proceeded to develop a comprehensive monitoring protocol for fiscal and program reviews of the ORR-funded refugee medical assistance program.

### (b) Technical Assistance

The Regional Offices of ORR have the day to day responsibility to conduct ongoing monitoring and provide technical assistance activities to States. ORR Central Office provided assistance by conducting on-site training and holding consultations with State officials who are responsible for the collection, preparation, and reporting of data for the quarterly performance report (QPR). The QPR is used for program monitoring and performance analysis. ORR technical assistance activities have been focused on States with large concentrations of refugees, particularly California, Washington, Oregon, Illinois, and Minnesota. These efforts have enabled ORR to develop and issue uniform reporting standards and service criteria for several key elements of the QPR such as the caseload accounting system for cash assistance recipients, medical users data, and definitions of job placement and job retention.

An additional initiative developed by ORR at the end of FY 1984 for implementation in FY 1985 is a Regional Office issuance system in which technical guidance materials issued to the Regions for the purpose of monitoring States and other grantees are consolidated into a comprehensive manual. This system is being used by ORR Regional Offices primarily to conduct formal reviews of State programs and grantees. The Regional Office issuance system should help ORR to achieve a higher degree of consistency in the way the refugee resettlement program is monitored from State to State.

### (c) Casefile Reviews

ORR completed the necessary followup activities to the casefile reviews initiated during FY 1983 in the following States: Arizona, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, and Washington.

Formal audit reviews conducted by the HHS Office of the Inspector General were substituted for casefile reviews in California, Colorado, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

With the exception of three States, ORR findings from the casefile reviews have demonstrated that the States have maintained a high level of compliance with ORR policies and regulations. Furthermore, the States reviewed were receptive to improving elements of their systems found to be inconsistent with ORR policies. In Arizona, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, and Washington the equivalent true-value error rates of the total caseload identified from the sample casefiles were less than 3 percent, which is the highest acceptable level of error established by ORR in its field monitoring guidelines. States identified with error rates higher than 3 percent were Massachusetts, Illinois, and Minnesota. In the case of Massachusetts, which had a level of error higher than 3 percent in several review categories, ORR recommended that a formal audit be initiated. Illinois and Minnesota were audited in FY 1984 and followup casefile reviews are being conducted during FY 1985.

In those States where problems were identified, the nature of the errors from the casefile were generally associated with the following deficiencies:

-- Lack of an effective eligibility determination procedure and proper classification of refugees under the appropriate assistance categories -- i.e., AFDC, refugee cash assistance (RCA), and general assistance (GA).

- Lack of a uniform and effective procedure to identify refugee recipients who became ineligible for ORR-reimbursed assistance at the end of the 18-month period for the RCA program and the 36-month period for the AFDC and GA programs.

-- Lack of an effective periodic eligibility redetermination process, lack of verification with sponsors or voluntary agencies of financial support and employment, and, to a more limited extent, lack of documentation of refugee status and work registration.

(d) Followup

ORR findings from the casefile reviews became the basis for ORR to request affected States to take corrective action. Where necessary, States took the following corrective actions in response to ORR findings:

-- Improvement of the internal process to identify refugee recipients who become time-expired;

-- Modification of State and local income maintenance operations manuals to improve the eligibility determination process;

-- Establishment of linkage procedures for local welfare offices to communicate with the sponsors and voluntary agencies before assistance is approved for refugees.

-- Assurance that refugees who applied for assistance register for employment and participate in employment services and other social services as a condition for continuing receipt of public assistance.

Finally, where the problems were significant ORR recommended that the Office of the Inspector General conduct a formal audit. A summary of the audits conducted in FY 1984 is presented below.

(e) Audits

Formal audits of State refugee programs have been undertaken by the HHS Inspector General's Office in several States. The findings are summarized below.

- **California**

  A recovery of $33.8 million was recommended. The recommendation was based on findings that: Los Angeles county did not require RCA recipients to submit monthly eligibility reports; Los Angeles county did not require GA refugee recipients to meet the same requirements as non-refugee recipients; case records were incomplete; counties claimed 100 percent reimbursement for refugees who were eligible for AFDC; counties claimed reimbursement for time-ineligible refugees; and the San Diego unaccompanied minors program did not comply with Federal policy. An audit of medical assistance is in process.

- **Colorado**

  The final audit report recommended recovery of $61,368 for overcharges resulting from accounting errors.

- **District of Columbia**

  ORR has been credited $131,022 for checks that were returned uncashed or outstanding and subsequently cancelled. A portion of these funds will be credited to the Office of Family Assistance which administers the AFDC program.

- **Florida**

  A recovery of $195,749 was recommended. The audit found that payments had been made to ineligible refugees and entrants and to an entrant unaccompanied minor. An audit of impact aid is in process.

- **Illinois**

  The Inspector General's Office recommended that $772,597 be recovered because these funds were based on expenditures not related to program activities and that $728,254 be recovered primarily for payments to time-ineligible recipients.

- **Indiana**

  The final audit report recommended an adjustment of $55,000 for the State's overpayment to a contractor.

- **Maryland**

  There were no significant findings.

- **Massachusetts**

  An audit of cash and medical assistance is in process.

- Minnesota

  A recovery of $2,874 was recommended for time-ineligible recipients. An audit initiated by the State of Minnesota recommended a recovery of $53,900 based on tuition charges deemed unallowable under terms of a social service contract, overstated tuition claims, and lack of student program records.

- New York

  The Inspector General's Office has not completed the audit.

- Pennsylvania

  A recovery of $2.2 million was recommended -- $1.3 million for credits due ORR from returned and refunded checks and $.9 million for payments to ineligible refugees.

- Virginia

  The findings indicated potential cost avoidance of $206,000. No recovery was recommended.

- Wisconsin

  The Inspector General's Office is still conducting the audit.

Final recovery has not been made on many audits. States may appeal amounts finally determined for recovery by ORR.

## Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program

Congress, responding to an Administration request, appropriated funds in fiscal year 1979 to provide assistance and services to refugees through a program of matching grants to voluntary resettlement agencies. Under this program, Federal funds of up to $1,000 per refugee have been provided on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis to voluntary agencies who participated in the program.

The matching grant program was devised to provide services to refugees which complement those services provided under the Department of State's initial reception and placement grants, and to provide an alternative to the State-administered programs funded by ORR. In the second quarter of FY 1984, a grant announcement and program guidelines were issued to further define and clarify requirements of the program. These requirements include "essential services" which are: Maintenance services (food and housing) to be provided for up to three months following the initial 30 days provided under the terms of the State Department's reception and placement grant (during which time the refugee normally would not receive public cash assistance), case management services, and job development provided by the grantee.

Voluntary agencies submitted applications for funding which were reviewed competitively. Five applicants, including two agencies which had not previously participated in the program, were selected by the Director of ORR for funding.

Grants totaling $4,000,000 were awarded under the matching grant program in FY 1984. The agencies participating in the program, together with the Federal funds awarded to them, are listed below. ORR is now conducting extensive monitoring of the program to assess performance under the program's new guidelines.

| Agency | Federal Grant |
|---|---|
| American Council for Nationalities Service | $ 23,100 |
| Church World Service | $ 36,875* |
| Council of Jewish Federations | $ 1,615,350* |
| International Rescue Committee | $ 728,837* |
| Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service | $ 118,013* |
| Tolstoy Foundation | $ 27,750 |
| United States Catholic Conference | $ 1,450,075* |
| TOTAL | $ 4,000,000 |

---

* Denotes participation under new program guidelines.

## Refugee Health

Refugees often have health problems due to the conditions which exist in their country of origin or during their flight and wait for resettlement. During FY 1984 these problems were addressed by activities in the first asylum camps, during processing, and after arrival in the United States.

Medical volunteers and others continued to treat refugee health problems as well as improve the general health conditions in refugee camps. Public health advisors from the U.S. Public Health Service's Centers for Disease Control (CDC) were stationed in Southeast Asia to monitor the quality of medical screening for U.S.-bound refugees. At the U.S. ports-of-entry, refugees and their medical records were inspected by CDC quarantine officers, who also notified the appropriate State and local health departments of the arrival of these refugees.

Recognizing that the medical problems of refugees, while not constituting a public health hazard, may affect their effective resettlement and employment, ORR provided support to State and local health agencies through a $6.1 million interagency agreement with CDC. These funds were awarded through a grant process by the Public Health Service Regional Offices for the conduct of health assessments.

Because Southeast Asian refugees currently remain in Southeast Asia for four to five months for English language training and cultural orientation programs, refugees with active tuberculosis complete their medical treatment at that time, prior to resettlement in the U.S. (For a more detailed discussion of Public Health Service activities covering refugee health matters see Appendix B.)

The efficacy of the programs mentioned above is attested to by the fact that over 710,000 Southeast Asian refugees have been resettled in the United States since 1975 without major adverse consequences to the public's health.

## Refugee Education

Based on an interagency agreement between ORR and the Department of Education, funding during FY 1984, was provided for the special educational needs of refugee children who are enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools. This program is known as the Transition Program for Refugee Children. Under this State-administered program, funds were distributed through formula grants based on the number of eligible refugee children in the States. These grants to State educational agencies are then distributed to local educational agencies as formula-based subgrants. The most significant factor in the formula for deciding a State's funding allocation is the number of eligible refugee children who have been here less than one year, because the needs of recent arrivals are generally more critical and require immediate attention. More importance is also placed on the number of eligible children enrolled in secondary schools than on children in elementary schools, because older children usually require more language resources and support.

Activities funded through the Transition Program include: Supplemental educational services oriented toward instruction to improve English language skills; bilingual education; remedial programs; school counseling and guidance services; in-service training for educational personnel; and training for parents. Under the program, State administrative costs are limited to one percent of a State educational agency's funding allocation, and support services costs are limited to 15 percent of each local educational agency's allocation.

The following funds have been distributed:

| Fiscal Year | For Use in School Year | Amount |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | 1980-81 | $23,168,000 |
| 1981 | 1981-82 | $22,268,000* |
| 1982 | 1982-83 | $22,700,000** |
| 1983 | 1983-84 | $16,600,000 |
| 1984 | 1984-85 | $16,600,000 |

Since 1981, a large number of State school systems have organized summer educational programs for refugee children using Transition Program funding. According to State officials, the outcome of such programming is that refugee children are performing in school at higher levels than projected.

---

* Although funds were appropriated in FY 1981, the actual distribution of this amount for the 1981-1982 school year did not occur until FY 1982 (that is, after September 30, 1981).

** This amount includes: $19,700,000 from FY 1982 funding, and $3,000,000 from FY 1981 carryover. These funds were distributed prior to September 30, 1982.

## National Discretionary Projects

During FY 1984 the Office of Refugee Resettlement funded a number of national projects with social service and targeted assistance funds designated for this purpose. A total of $4,658,561 was obligated in FY 1984 in support of projects to improve refugee resettlement operations at the national, regional, State, and community levels. The activities described below address one or more of the following four priority objectives: (1) To support the continuation of innovative resettlement projects which provide alternatives to concentration of refugees in impacted areas; (2) to improve the quality and accessibility of social services to refugee populations; (3) to strengthen the capacity and expand the role of refugee community organizations to deliver priority social services within their service areas; and (4) to support management assistance by refugee organizations for the development and maintenance of refugee owned and operated businesses which (a) provide employment opportunities for low income unemployed and underemployed refugees and (b) provide economic, cultural, and social benefits other than employment to low income refugees.

### o Demonstration Projects to Increase the Number of Wage Earners in Refugee and Entrant Households

Grants were awarded to five States for the purpose of providing concentrated refugee social services to underserved refugees and entrants, such as hard-to-place men, women, and youth in large (three or more members) households, in order to increase the number of wage earners in these households thereby reducing their dependency on cash or other public assistance.

Innovative projects ranging from training for home-based day care services to high-tech industries are being offered for women, youth, and older men. Total funding for the following projects is $647,981.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Arizona Department of Economic Security<br>Refugee Resettlement Program<br>P.O. Box 6123, Site Code 086Z<br>Phoenix, Arizona 85005 | $79,774 |
| 2. | Illinois Department of Public Aid<br>Refugee Resettlement Program<br>624 S. Michigan Avenue, 11th Floor<br>Chicago, Illinois 60605 | $118,873 |
| 3. | Missouri Department of Social Services<br>Division of Family Services<br>P.O. Box 88<br>Jefferson City, Missouri 65601 | $149,334 |
| 4. | State of Washington<br>Department of Social and Health Services<br>Bureau of Refugee Assistance<br>Box OB-31B<br>Olympia, Washington 98504 | $150,000 |
| 5. | Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services<br>Refugee Assistance Office Program<br>P.O. Box 7851<br>Madison, Wisconsin 53707 | $150,000 |

o Demonstration Projects for Enhanced Skills Training, Job Placement, and Followup Assistance to Employ Targeted Refugee and Entrant Populations

The purpose of this program is to provide enhanced skills training, job placement and post training assistance to targeted refugees and entrants to increase their chances of obtaining jobs or self-employment at adequate rates of compensation which will result in a decrease of the refugee or entrant family's total dependence upon public assistance. The targeted populations served are refugees and entrants who are unemployed, who are receiving cash assistance or are at risk of having to resort to interstate secondary migration in order to secure cash assistance benefits, and who have histories of extended difficulties in workforce entry and/or advancement due to deficiencies in job skills and English language skills.

Total cost for 14 projects is $1,807,862.

1. State of Washington
Department of Social and Health Services
Bureau of Refugee Assistance
Box OB-31B
Olympia, Washington 98504 $97,500

2. Kansas State Dept. of Social and Rehabilitation Services
Income Maintenance and Med. Programs
State Office Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612 $78,000

3. Nebraska Department of Social Services
P.O. Box 95026
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509 $148,843

4. Arkansas Department of Human Services
Division of Social Services
Seventh and Main Streets
P.O. Box 1437
Little Rock, Arkansas $100,000

5. Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services
Resettlement Assistance Office
P.O. Box 7851
Madison, Wisconsin 53707 $150,000

6. Illinois Department of Public Aid
Refugee Resettlement Program
624 S. Michigan, 11th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60605 $74,180

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7. | Georgia Dept. of Human Resources<br>Div. of Family and Children Services<br>47 Trinity Avenue, S.W.<br>Atlanta, Georgia 30334-1202 | $82,500 |
| 8. | North Carolina Department of Human Resources<br>325 N. Salisbury St.<br>Raleigh, North Carolina 27611 | $70,000 |
| 9. | Department of Social Services<br>8007 Discovery Drive<br>Richmond, Virginia 23288 | $212,398 |
| 10. | Maryland Social Services Adm.<br>Office of Refugee Affairs<br>101 W. Read Street, Rm. 621<br>Baltimore, Maryland 21202 | $79,705 |
| 11. | Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare<br>600 Washington Street<br>Boston, Massachusetts 02111 | $150,000 |
| 12. | Vermont Department of Social Rehabilitation Services<br>Refugee Resettlement Program<br>103 S. Main St.<br>Waterbury, Vermont 05676 | $106,810 |
| 13. | New Jersey Department of Human Services<br>Coordinator for Refugees<br>222 S. Warren Street<br>Trenton, New Jersey 08625 | $161,888 |
| 14. | Refugee Assistance Program<br>New York State Department of Social Services<br>40 North Pearl Street<br>Albany, New York 12243 | $296,038 |

- Planned Secondary Resettlement Program (PSRP)

PSRP grants are for the purpose of assisting clearly defined groups of refugees who are experiencing severe and protracted unemployment and public assistance dependency to achieve accelerated economic self-sufficiency through carefully planned relocation to communities offering favorable resettlement opportunities. Two classes of grants are available to State applicants: Planning grants and resettlement grants.

Planning grants are for the purpose of identifying and assessing prospective resettlement communities and preparing both the interested refugee population and the prospective resettlement community for the planned relocation of refugees. A primary outcome of a planning grant is a documented resettlement plan.

Resettlement grants are for the purpose of providing requisite social services and resettlement allowances for the refugees undertaking the planned resettlement. Resettlement grants are awarded on the merits of an acceptable resettlement plan.

In fiscal year 1984, the first year of the PSRP, two planning grants totaling $24,073 were awarded.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Arizona Department of Economic Security<br>Refugee Resettlement Program<br>P.O. Box 6123, Site Code 086Z<br>Phoenix, Arizona 85005 | $13,956 |
| 2. | North Carolina Department of Human Resources<br>325 N. Salisbury St.<br>Raleigh, North Carolina 27611 | $10,117 |

o **Favorable Alternate Sites Project (FASP)**

A Favorable Alternate Sites Project grant was awarded to the State of Arizona to continue this program for a second year. The FASP program is designed to identify and test resettlement sites which are suitable alternatives to communities with unfavorable resettlement conditions. Funds were provided to support planned cluster placements of 425 "free case"

Vietnamese refugees in the Phoenix and Tucson areas. ("Free cases" are refugees without immediate family members in the U.S.) The project includes coordinated community planning and orientation, supplemental social services, and a management information tracking system.

| | |
|---|---|
| Arizona Department of Economic Security<br>Refugee Resettlement Program<br>P.O. Box 6123, Site Code 086Z<br>Phoenix, Arizona 85005 | $164,446 |

o Refugee Mental Health Demonstration Project

A supplemental award was granted to St. Elizabeth's Hospital of Boston to support the development of an effective instrument to screen Cambodian, Laotian, and Vietnamese refugees for depression and anxiety. The screening instrument will be developed from the HCL 25, a clincial test for depression and anxiety which was designed by Johns Hopkins University and has been used widely for a number of years. Funds were granted to: Test/retest to establish instrument reliability; determine community norms; print 1,000 copies in each language; and prepare instructional materials to train mental health practitioners to administer the test.

| | |
|---|---|
| St. Elizabeth's Hospital of Boston<br>Indochinese Psychiatric Clinic<br>736 Cambridge Street<br>Boston, Massachusetts 02135 | $17,092 |

o Grant to Train Refugee Resettlement Program Leadership

This project will establish a national training program consisting of three presentations of a symposium designed for key administrators and managers of State refugee agencies, national and local voluntary agencies, refugee organizations, and social service providers. The symposium will be designed to provide the participants with an understanding of the general context of the national refugee resettlement program and of current and anticipated structural, policy, and procedural changes as they affect the operations of each of the agencies within the program. It is anticipated that the participants, upon completion of the symposium will have an improved understanding of the impact upon their respective agencies and will develop an initial plan of action to improve their organizations' effectiveness.

| | |
|---|---|
| Georgetown University<br>Center for Immigration Policy and Refugee Assistance<br>37th and O Streets, N.W.<br>Washington, D.C. 20057 | $75,000 |

o Highland Lao Initiative Supplement Grants

The purpose of the Highland Lao Initiative supplements is to provide continuing support to Highland Lao projects, funded in FY 1983, whose activities have contributed significantly to increased community stability and employment to Highland Lao communities outside the State of California. Support is provided to Highland Lao MAAs who have performed meritoriously and where the additional immediate funding is needed to secure a continuation of this performance. Four awards totaled $237,446:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | New York State Department of Social Services<br>40 N. Pearl St.<br>Albany, New York 12243 | $45,000 |

2. The Hmong United Association of Greater Pennsylvania
3944 Baring Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104 $62,270

3. The Laotian Assistance Organization, Inc.
282 W. Bowery Street
Akron, Ohio 44307 $22,176

4. Michigan Department of Social Services
300 South Capitol Avenue
P.O. Box 30037
Lansing, Michigan 48909 $108,000

- Highland Lao Agricultural Workshop

A national workshop for Highland Lao and American representatives of Highland Lao farm projects was supported through a grant supplemental to the Indochina Resources Action Center. The two-day workshop held in Minnesota provided an opportunity for participants to: (1) Share information and experiential knowledge on all aspects of farming; and (2) to learn from experts in the areas of marketing, farm production, farm management, and financial planning and resource development.

Indochina Resources Action Center
1424 16th St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036 $25,168

- Refugee Employment Services Program Standards Development Project

The Office of Refugee Resettlement entered into a cooperative agreement with the National Governors' Association for the purpose of assisting in the development and implemention of performance-driven management systems for refugee employment services programs nationwide. The cooperative agreement encompasses three major activities: (1) the convening of an advisory committee and technical work group comprised of State and local refugee program managers to provide guidance to NGA throughout the 18-month project period; (2) to hold formal consultations with the fifty-one (forty-nine States, the District of Columbia, and Guam) Refugee State Coordinators to discuss both policy and technical aspects of designing and developing performance standards; and (3) to provide technical assistance and training to States participating in the pilot phase of the project. During the pilot phase, the design of a standardized Glossary of Terms and Service Definitions for use by employment services providers is being tested by those States that volunteer to participate in the design phase of the project.

National Governors' Association
444 North Capitol Street, N.E.
Suite 250
Washington, D.C. 20001 $345,675

- Mainstream English Language Training (MELT) Supplements

In fiscal year 1983, ORR funded seven Mainstream English Language Training (MELT) projects to test, refine, implement, and validate English language testing instruments, student performance levels, and an employment-focused core curriculum for future use by domestic refugee English language training programs. In fiscal year 1984, supplemental funding was provided to the seven MELT projects for overall data analysis and coordination of information across project sites. The outcome data will be used by ORR in the formulation of standards for ORR-funded adult refugee English language training programs. Total supplemental funding is $96,582.

1. Project Persona
375 Broad Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02907 $4,475

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2. | International Institute of Boston<br>287 Commonwealth Avenue<br>Boston, Massachusetts 02115 | $10,763 |
| 3. | Refugee Education and Employment Program (REEP)<br>Wilson School<br>1601 Wilson Boulevard<br>Arlington, Virginia 22209 | $9,368 |
| 4. | Northwest Educational Cooperative (NEC)<br>"Tri-States MELT Consortium"<br>500 S. Dwyer Avenue<br>Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005 | $19,014 |
| 5. | Spring Institute for International Studies<br>5025 Lowell Boulevard<br>Denver, Colorado 80221 | $21,684 |
| 6. | San Diego Community College District<br>5350 University Avenue<br>San Diego, California 92105 | $18,214 |
| 7. | San Francisco Community College District<br>33 Gough Street<br>San Francisco, California 94103 | $13,064 |

o Tacoma Community House Western Volunteer Training Project

A grant was provided to the Tacoma Community House, Tacoma, Washington, for a 12-month demonstration project entitled the "Western Volunteer Training Project" (Western VTP) to provide technical assistance on the provision of English-as-a-second-language (ESL) services to 8 volunteer ESL programs in Idaho, Oregon, Montana, and Colorado. The goal of the Western VTP is to strengthen volunteer ESL services to refugees through a technical assistance program consisting of: (1) Guidance to volunteer coordinators on program management; (2) training of volunteer teachers in ESL teaching methods; and (3) the provision of instructional textbooks, training materials, and a handbook for ESL tutors.

Tacoma Community House
Western Volunteer Training Project
1311 South M Street
P.O. Box 5107
Tacoma, Washington 98405 $55,000

o Vocational English Language Training (VELT)

The Research Management Corporation (RMC) of Falls Church, Virginia, was provided funding for a contract for a 12-month project to develop a Vocational English Language Training (VELT) resource package. The package will identify and describe a wide range of materials suitable for planning, implementing, and evaluating VELT programs. The package includes a glossary of VELT terms, description of model programs, a bibliography of VELT materials, and a list of resource individuals and agencies.

Research Management Corporation (RMC)
7115 Leesburg Pike, Suite 327
Falls Church, Virginia 22043 $144,862

o Technical Assistance to ORR Regional Offices

During FY 1984, ORR Regional Offices received $1,017,374 for technical assistance contracts to improve State and local responsiveness to strengthen program development in priority areas.

Each participating Regional Office received a base allocation of $136,000. Contracts were implemented in the following program areas:

- Refugee Leadership and Program Management Technical Assistance for Mutual Assistance Associations.

  Ten contracts totaling - $377,717

- Mental Health Crisis Intervention Training and Technical Assistance.

  Six contracts totaling - $448,357

- Technical Assistance for Business and Economic Development.

  Three contracts totaling - $136,400

- Vocational Language Training and use of Volunteers.

  Two contracts totaling - $54,900

## Program Evaluation

During the reporting period, the Office of Refugee Resettlement continued its program of evaluation and research in order to: Document the characteristics of the program's implementation at the State and local levels, as well as the effects and outcomes of the program for refugees and for States and local communities and institutions; clarify the policy and operational issues of the program; understand the extent and process of refugees' social and economic adjustment; and assess qualitatively specific program services and special projects.

Descriptions of evaluation contracts awarded in FY 1984 follow:

- Assessment of Refugee Program Alternatives, contracted to Lewin and Associates, Inc. with Refugee Policy Group, Berkeley Planning Associates, and American Institutes for Research. This is a "task order" contract. The task awarded in FY 1984 for $95,224 is a review of "case management" in the refugee program. The task is (a) to clarify the perceived and intended objectives of case management systems and the logic underlying various existing approaches to case management in operational programs; (b) to describe and analyze variations in the design and implementation of case management models as implemented and as conceived; (c) to identify potential measures for assessing the outcomes and cost-effectiveness of differing case management models; and (d) to make recommendations on implementation options for case management in the refugee program.

- Evaluation of the Highland Lao Initiative, contracted for $154,481 to Coffey, Zimmerman and Associates. The purpose of this contract is to assess the effects of ORR's Highland Lao Initiative, a program of grants in excess of $3 million to 24 States for the purpose of treating the special resettlement problems of persistently high unemployment and welfare dependence among the Hmong and other Highland Lao refugees. The contract is to evaluate the impact of the grants in helping to improve the economic status of Highland Lao refugees in communities outside of California, to foster stability in these communities, and, by doing so, to stem secondary migration to areas of high Highland Lao refugee concentration and poor employment prospects, such as the Central Valley in California.
- Evaluation of the Targeted Assistance Grant Program, contracted for $299,683 to Research Management Corporation. The purpose of this evaluation is to describe what is being done to assist refugees to become self-sufficient in localities receiving targeted assistance funds; to identify and describe models of service delivery/activities which are working well for specific communities; to describe the outcomes of the grants for clients and communities relative to the variety and quality of different local strategies for utilizing grant monies; and to provide guidance on the replicability of those activities and strategies which appear to have the most positive effects.

The following evaluation study, contracted in FY 1983, remains in progress:

- Study of Refugee Utilization of Public Medical Assistance, contracted for $204,000 to Systemetrics Inc., of Santa Barbara, CA, and Urban Systems Research and Engineering, Inc., of Cambridge, MA. The purpose of this study is to obtain information on the patterns of refugee utilization of public medical assistance, including type of service, frequency, cost, and condition for which assistance is sought. The study will also discuss issues related to employability, health care needs, health services delivery, and the health adjustment of this population. The study includes the States of California, New York, and Tennessee and will be based on data for calendar years 1980, 1981, and 1982, available through State Medicaid Management Information Systems. The study will also compare refugee patterns of medical assistance utilization with those of the general Medicaid recipient population. A report on the findings from these data is to be available in June 1985.

The following studies were completed in FY 1984:

- An Evaluation of the Favorable Alternate Sites Project (FASP), contracted for $38,263 to Berkeley Planning Associates in FY 1983. FASP was instituted to settle "free case" refugees in communities not already densely populated by refugees and in which job prospects were favorable.

The study was conducted in Phoenix and Tucson, Arizona, and in Greensboro and Charlotte, North Carolina. The results of the study show high success in finding refugees jobs. In all sites, at least one family member in each FASP household was employed within 3 to 4 months after arrival, and households then improved their economic position by increasing the number of adults employed per household, by working longer hours, and by holding more than one job. Also, job mobility was occurring and job-finding skills were apparent.

The record on secondary migration was excellent for Greensboro, which had 3 percent out-migration, but less favorable for the other sites. Out-migration was 52 percent for Charlotte, 27 percent for Tucson, and 45 percent for Phoenix. Some of this occurred because refugees arriving in the sites had been inadequately screened. They were not "free" cases and moved almost immediately to be with relatives in another site. Despite the high out-migration in all but one site, other FASP objectives were realized. Alternative, viable clusters were established (some in-migration has also occurred and family reunification will result in more in the future), employment for many was achieved, and refugees who would otherwise have gone to densely populated areas were settled in areas where the labor market was receptive. Aided by some of the additional information in the report relating to how implementation can be further improved, ORR plans to continue with FASP and to encourage States to participate.

The following summaries are of four research papers contracted to review and analyze existing information on the effects of the refugee program in four subject areas: health services utilization, earned income and transfer payments, residency patterns and secondary migration, and labor force participation and employment.

- Health Service Utilization Patterns of Southeast Asian Refugees: Rhode Island Medicaid/Refugee Medical Assistance, contracted for $6,025 to Ms. Lynn August. The study was based on available data in the State of Rhode Island. The findings show a basically healthy population underutilizing all services except those related to pregnancy and childhood diseases. Although there is high utilization of health services in the first 90 days -- presumably due to medical screening and followup -- overall, the Southeast Asian refugees use health services at a much lower rate than the general population. Medical assistance expenditures for refugees in Rhode Island are also lower than for the general AFDC population in actual dollars per family despite larger refugee family sizes.

- Refugee Earnings and Utilization of Financial Assistance Programs, contracted for $4,875 to Mr. David North. The study presents a summary of available data on refugee earnings and on utilization of cash assistance and food stamp programs.

  The Vietnamese who arrived in 1975 have done well. By 1979 their median earnings were greater than those for U.S. workers. Male refugees earned substantially less than their U.S. counterparts, but they did better than U.S. women. Younger refugee workers (16-24) and women refugee workers close the earnings gap between them and their U.S. counterparts faster than refugee males 25 and over.

Former refugee military officers generally earned more in the U.S. than former civil servants and enlisted personnel, and all refugees with a public sector background earned more than those with a private sector background. Greater education also affects income positively but more so for men than for women. Geographically, men in Illinois and Texas earn more than those elsewhere. Migration also appears to affect earnings. The highest earnings in given years are recorded by "stayers", the lowest by those who moved to California. However, migrants show the largest increase in earnings (1978 to 1979), indicating that on average they improved their lot by migrating.

Looking at data available for all refugees -- i.e., not just Vietnamese and not just those arriving in 1975 -- the Vietnamese consistently have fared the best. All refugees were hurt by the 1982-83 recession disproportionately in comparison to their U.S. worker counterparts. Overall, the earnings of refugees clearly place many of them in the lower tiers of the U.S. labor market, working at or near the minimum wage.

Utilization of food stamps and cash assistance declines steadily -- if slowly -- over time. In the first year, about 4 refugees out of 5 are receiving some form of assistance, dropping to 3 out of 5 in 3 years and stabilizing at 1-1/2 to 2 out of 5 after 4-1/2 to 5 years. Self-sufficiency is a long process. It is also much affected by household size and by the level of education of the adult members, as well as by geographic location -- e.g., very high dependence on cash assistance in California, very low in Texas. Finally, it is influenced by the general economy. The early arrivals -- e.g., Vietnamese in 1975 -- were better established in the economy by 1982-83, when more recent arrivals often were laid off and unable to find work.

- Residency Patterns and Secondary Migration of Refugees, contracted for $4,990 to Dr. Susan Forbes. The study synthesizes available research on the title subject and places it in a historical and comparative context.

Since 1945, official and informal U.S. policy has been to disperse refugees in order to minimize the effects on receiving communities. This policy has never been effectively carried out. The vast majority of previous mass arrivals--e.g., Hungarians, Cubans--settled in the areas where earlier arriving compatriots lived. The Vietnamese arriving in 1975 were initially dispersed, but 45 percent had relocated by 1980. Nevertheless, the policy of dispersal, effected through geographically broad sponsorship by voluntary agencies and receiving communities, established potential recipient clusters in many areas with the result that despite high secondary migration, the Indochinese remain more dispersed than comparable immigrant/refugee groups.

Although limited to cash assistance recipients, data show that 75 percent of the refugees on assistance remain in the State where they were resettled. Only 5 States gained net refugee population through migration (California, Massachusetts, Virginia, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin). Consistent with general migration patterns, substantial refugee population exchange occurs among contiguous or nearby States.

- Labor Force Participation and Employment of Southeast Asian Refugees in the U.S., contracted for $4,815 to Dr. Robert Bach. This study draws primarily on data from ORR's Annual Survey, but also relates these findings to data from other studies.

Compared to the U.S. population as a whole, labor force participation by refugees is about 10 percent less, and refugees have an unemployment rate almost 10 percent higher. At the height of unemployment in 1982 the difference was 14.2 percent, indicating refugees' vulnerability in a fragile job market.

Refugees' work activities follow a pattern similar to that of U.S. workers: Young adults, who are frequently engaged in alternate activities, such as education and training, and older refugees participate less in the labor force than do adults in prime working ages. Refugee women have a 10-percent lower probability of labor force participation than refugee men.

Level of education prior to arrival in the U.S. is by far the strongest influence on the probability of refugees' participation in the labor force. Household size and residence in California are both negatively related to labor force participation.

The effect of English proficiency on labor force participation is extensively analyzed in this study. The conclusion: English proficiency appears to serve more as a symbol of a refugee's other advantages which promote labor force participation, such as education, than it does as a specific door-opening tool, although English proficiency may be of considerable value relative to other aspects of adjustment.

Length of time in the U.S. is important as a factor in economic progress, but it may be less so than the analysis of some data has suggested. Also the time needed for newcomers to reach economic levels comparable to the U.S. workforce may be much longer than most have assumed. One study of immigrants cited suggests more than 30 years for some. Generally, studies focusing on length of time in the U.S. as a predictor of economic well-being have presented overly optimistic conclusions.

The most prevalent techniques for job search are personal initiative, friends, and sponsors. Job mobility in particular relies on personal initiative.

Most employed refugees are in low skilled jobs which require the least training to enter and few opportunities for on-the-job training and advancement. Four broad occupational categories employ roughly the same proportion of refugees: Technical, sales, and administrative support (14.4 percent); service (21.9 percent); precision production, craft, and repair (21.4 percent); and operators and fabricators (19.3 percent).

The thesis of this paper is that the economic and employment problems of refugees are rooted in the labor market and their conditions of employment, rather than in the welfare system, predicting that the level of public assistance will decline when refugees' employment situation improves, not the reverse.

## Data and Data System Development

Maintenance and development of ORR's computerized data system on refugees continued during FY 1984. Information on refugees arriving from all areas of the world is received from several sources and compiled by ORR staff. Records were on file by the end of FY 1984 for approximately 820,000 out of a possible 935,000 refugees who have entered the U.S. since 1975. This data system is the source of most of the tabulations presented in Appendix A.

Since November 1982, ORR's Monthly Data Report has covered refugees of all nationalities. This report continues to be distributed to State and local officials by the State Refugee Coordinators, while ORR distributes the report directly to Federal officials and to national offices of voluntary agencies. The monthly report provides information on estimated cumulative State populations of Southeast Asian refugees who have arrived since 1975; States of destination of new refugee arrivals; country of birth, citizenship, age, and sex of newly arriving refugees; and the numbers of new refugee arrivals sponsored by each voluntary resettlement agency. Also, a special set of summary tabulations is produced monthly for each State and mailed to the State Refugee Coordinators for their use. In addition to the same categories of information produced for the national-level report, the State reports include a tabulation of the counties in which refugees are being placed. These reports provide a statistical profile of each State's refugees that can be used in many ways by State and local officials in the administration of the refugee program.

At the time of application to INS for permanent resident alien status, refugees provide information under section 412(a)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This collection of information is designed to furnish an update on the progress made by refugees during the one-year waiting period between their arrival in the U.S. and their application for adjustment of status. The data collection instrument focuses on the refugees' migration within the U.S., their current household composition, education and language training before and after arrival, employment history, English language ability, and assistance received. ORR links the new information with the arrival record, creating a longitudinal data file. Work continued during FY 1984 to develop this data file. Findings pertaining to the refugees who adjusted their status during FY 1984 are reported in the "Adjustment of Status" section, pages 103 and 104.

In FY 1984, ORR developed an interagency agreement with the Internal Revenue Service for the tabulation of summary data on incomes earned and Federal taxes paid by refugees who arrived from Southeast Asia between 1975 and 1979. Findings covering the 1980-1982 tax years are presented in the "Economic Adjustment" section, pages 101 and 102. This data series will be continued in future years.

## KEY FEDERAL ACTIVITES

### Congressional Consultations on Refugee Admissions

Consultations with the Congress on refugee admissions took place in September 1984 as required by the Refugee Act of 1980. After considering Congressional views, President Reagan signed a Presidential Declaration in October 1984, setting a world-wide refugee admissions ceiling for the U.S. at 70,000 for FY 1985. This includes subceilings of 50,000 refugees for East Asia; 9,000 for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; 5,000 for the Near East/South Asia; 3,000 for Africa; and 3,000 for Latin America/Caribbean. In addition, the President designated that an additional 5,000 refugee admissions numbers shall be made available for the adjustment to permanent residence status of aliens who have been granted asylum in the United States, since this is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest.

### Reauthorization of the Refugee Act of 1980, as Amended

During FY 1984, the House passed legislation to reauthorize the Refugee Act of 1980 as amended by the Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982. The Senate, however, did not complete action on the legislation by the close of FY 1984. Funds for the refugee program were appropriated under the Continuing Resolution for FY 1985.

# III. REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

## POPULATION PROFILE

This section characterizes the refugees in the United States, focusing primarily on those who have entered since 1975. Information is presented on their nationality, age, sex, and geographic distribution. All tables referenced by number appear in Appendix A.

### Nationality, Age, and Sex

Southeast Asians remain the largest category among recent refugee arrivals, and the number arriving in the United States increased in FY 1984 compared with FY 1983. By the end of the year, approximately 711,000 were in the country. At that time, about 7 percent had been in the U.S. for less than one year, and only 23 percent had been in the country for three years or less. About 42 percent of the Southeast Asians arrived in the U.S. in the FY 1980-1981 period.

Vietnamese are still the majority group among the refugees from Southeast Asia, although the ethnic composition of the entering population has become more diverse over time. In 1975 and most of the subsequent five years, about 90 percent of the arriving Southeast Asian refugees were Vietnamese. Their share of the whole has declined gradually, especially since persons from Cambodia and Laos began to arrive in larger numbers in 1980. No complete enumeration of any refugee population has been carried out since January 1981, the last annual Alien Registration undertaken by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). At that time, 72.3 percent of the Southeast Asians who registered were from Vietnam, 21.3 percent were from Laos, and 6.4 percent were from Cambodia. By the end of FY 1984, the Vietnamese made up 65 percent of the total, while 20 percent were from Laos and about 15 percent were from

Cambodia. The increasing proportion of arrivals from Cambodia in FY 1984 raised their proportion in the resident population slightly from one year earlier. About 38 percent of the refugees from Laos are from the highlands of that nation and are culturally distinct from the lowland Lao; this percentage remained stable during FY 1984.

The age-sex composition of the Southeast Asian population currently in the U.S. can be described by updating records created at the time of arrival in the U.S. About 56 percent of these refugees are males; 44 percent are females. The population has remained young because the gradual aging of the population that arrived beginning in 1975 is partially offset by the very young age structure of the newer arrivals. At the close of FY 1984, the median age of the resident population was 23.9, without a significant age difference between men and women. Approximately 6 percent of the refugees were preschoolers in late 1984; but this figure does not include children born in the U.S. to refugee families, and the actual proportion of young children in Southeast Asian families in the U.S. is known to be considerably larger. The school age population (6-17) of refugee children is about 28 percent of the total, and an additional 19 percent are young adults aged 18-24. A total of 54 percent of the population are adults in the principal working ages (18-44). About 2.5 percent, or roughly 17,000 people, are aged 65 or older.

While the Southeast Asians predominate among refugee arrivals since 1975, the Cubans remain the largest of the refugee groups admitted since World War II. Most of them entered in the 1960's and are firmly established in the United States. Many have become citizens. Since

1975, fewer than 40,000 Cuban refugees have arrived, which is less than 5 percent of all the Cuban refugees in the country.* Information on the age-sex composition of this refugee population is not available.

More than 100,000 Soviet refugees arrived in the United States between 1975 and 1984; the peak years were 1979 and 1980. Only Jews and Armenians have been permitted to emigrate by the Soviet authorities, ostensibly for reunification with their relatives in Western nations. Men and women are about equally represented in the Soviet refugee population. This is the oldest of the refugee groups: On the average Soviet refugees are approximately 40 years of age, and at least 15 percent are in their sixties or older.

Many other refugee groups of much smaller size have arrived in the United States since the enactment of the Refugee Act of 1980. By the end of FY 1984, the refugee populations from Afghanistan and Ethiopia were both approaching 14,000. Polish refugees admitted under the Refugee Act number more than 19,000, with 88 percent of them having arrived in the last three years. Nearly 16,000 Romanian refugees have entered since April 1, 1980, along with more than 4,000 Czechs and lesser numbers from the other Eastern European nations. Nearly 6,000 Iraqis and more than 4,000 Iranians have entered the United States in refugee status. Exact figures on the numbers of persons granted refugee status since April 1, 1980, are presented in Table 7.

---

* This discussion does not include the 125,000 Cubans designated as "entrants" who arrived during the 1980 boatlift.

## Geographic Location and Movement

Southeast Asian refugees live in every State and several territories of the United States. Large residential concentrations can be found in a number of West Coast cities and in Texas, as well as in several East Coast and Midwestern cities. Migration to California continued to affect refugee population distribution during FY 1984, but at the same time several States in other areas of the U.S. experienced significant growth due to both secondary migration and initial placements of refugees.

Because the INS Alien Registration of January 1981 was the most recent relatively complete enumeration of the resident refugee population, it was the starting point for the current estimate of their geographic distribution. (These 1981 data appeared in the ORR Report to the Congress for FY 1982.) The baseline figures as of January 1981 were increased by the known resettlements of new refugees between January 1981 and September 1984, and the resulting totals were adjusted for secondary migration, using new data presented below. The estimates of the current geographic distribution of the Southeast Asian refugee population derived in this manner are presented in Table 9.

At the close of FY 1984, the fourteen States with the largest estimated populations of Southeast Asian refugees were:

| State | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| California | 285,100 | 40.1% |
| Texas | 51,300 | 7.2 |
| Washington | 32,600 | 4.6 |
| New York | 24,800 | 3.5 |
| Pennsylvania | 23,900 | 3.4 |
| Illinois | 23,400 | 3.3 |
| Minnesota | 22,600 | 3.2 |
| Virginia | 21,000 | 3.0 |
| Massachusetts | 19,300 | 2.7 |
| Oregon | 17,200 | 2.4 |
| Louisiana | 13,500 | 1.9 |
| Florida | 11,500 | 1.6 |
| Colorado | 10,700 | 1.5 |
| Wisconsin | 10,300 | 1.4 |
| TOTAL | 567,200 | 79.8% |
| Other | 143,800 | 20.2% |
| TOTAL | 711,000 | 100.0% |

Of these fourteen States, the top thirteen were also the top thirteen States in terms of Southeast Asian population one year previously, at the close of FY 1983. Wisconsin replaced Michigan in fourteenth place. California, Texas, and Washington have held the top three positions since 1980. Rather small changes took place in the rank order of these thirteen States during FY 1984. After the top three States, the next five are within a few thousand of each other; New York rose to fourth place while Illinois replaced it in sixth place. The proportion of Southeast Asian refugees living in California is now estimated at 40.1 percent, an increase from the estimated 37.1 percent of one year earlier. California has continued to grow significantly through secondary migration, since it again in FY 1984 received a lower share of initial placements than its share of the total population.

Massachusetts, Oregon, and Wisconsin are estimated to have grown substantially in absolute numbers and to have increased their share of the refugee population by small fractions. Pennsylvania, Illinois, Virginia, and Louisiana grew more slowly than would have been expected, due to out-migration partially offsetting new arrivals, and their share of the estimated refugee population dropped accordingly; the changes were on the order of one-tenth of a percentage point. Texas and Florida are estimated to have lost more people through secondary migration than they gained through initial placements. The refugee populations of most other States have remained relatively stable during FY 1984.

A number of explanations for secondary migration by refugees have been sugggested: Employment opportunities, the pull of an established ethnic community, more generous welfare benefits, better training opportunities, reunification with relatives, or a congenial climate.

The adjustment of State population estimates for secondary migration through September 30, 1984, was accomplished through the use of the Refugee State-of-Origin Report. In the Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982, the Congress added specific language to the Refugee Act, directing ORR to compile and maintain data on the secondary migration of refugees within the United States. ORR developed the Refugee State-of-Origin Report and the current method of estimating secondary migration in 1983 in response to this directive.

The method of estimating secondary migration is based on the fact that the first three digits of social security numbers are assigned geographically in blocks by State. Almost all arriving refugees apply for social security numbers immediately upon arrival in the United States, with the assistance of their sponsors. Therefore, the first three digits of a refugee's social security number are a good indicator of his/her initial State of residence in the U.S. (The current system replaced an earlier program in which blocks of social security numbers were assigned to Southeast Asian refugees during processing before they arrived in the U.S. The block of numbers reserved for Guam was used in that program, which ended in late 1979.) If a refugee currently residing in California has a social security number assigned in Nevada, for example, the method treats that person as having moved from initial resettlement in Nevada to current residence in California.

States participating in the refugee program reported to ORR a summary tabulation of the first three digits of the social security numbers of the refugees currently receiving assistance or services in their programs as of June 30, 1984. The report will continue to be submitted annually. Most States chose to report tabulations of refugees participating in their cash and medical assistance programs, in which the social security numbers are already part of the refugee's record. Four States were able to add information on persons receiving only social services and not covered by cash/medical reporting systems. The reports received covered slightly more than half of the refugee population of less than three years' residence in the U.S.

Compilation of the tabulations submitted by all reporting States results in a 53x53 State (and territory) matrix, which contains information on migration from each State to every other State. In effect, State A's report shows how many people have migrated in from other States, as well as how many people who were initially placed in State A are currently there. The reports from every other State, when combined, show how many people have left State A. The fact that the reports are based on current assistance or service populations means, of course, that coverage does not extend to all refugees who have entered since 1975. However, the bias of this method is toward refugees who have entered in the past three years, the portion of the refugee population of greatest concern to ORR. Available information also indicates that much of the secondary migration of refugees takes place during their first few years of residence in the U.S., and that the refugee population becomes relatively stabilized in its geographic distribution after an initial adjustment period. The matrix of all possible pairs of in- and out-migration between States can be summarized into total in- and out-migration figures reported for each State, and these findings are presented in Table 10.

The Refugee State-of-Origin Reports summarized in Table 10 contained information on a total of 129,044 refugees, 57 percent of the refugee population whose residence in the U.S. was less than three years as of the reporting date. Of these refugees, 73 percent were still living in the State in which they were resettled initially. The reported interstate migrants numbered 34,422. Of this migration, 63.0 percent, representing nearly 22,000 people, was into California from other States. No other State received in-migration approaching the scale of California's. New York State was the second favored destination, attracting 2,444 people or 7.1 percent of the total reported migration. Washington State and Massachusetts each attracted more than 1,000 in-migrants. Almost all States experienced both gains and losses through secondary migration. On balance, however, only six States (Alabama, California, Colorado, Maryland, Massachusetts, and New York) gained net population through secondary migration. The States losing the most people through out-migration were Texas, New York, Illinois, Washington, and California; but since they were among the States with the largest numbers of resettlements during the past few years, they contained large numbers of potential out-migrants. Texas experienced the largest out-migration of any State, losing 5,030 people, and was the source of 14.6 percent of the reported out-migration. Examination of the detailed State-by-State matrix showed two major migration patterns: A movement into California from all other parts of the U.S., and a substantial amount of population exchange between contiguous or geographically close States. The first pattern is consistent with the historical pattern of migration by the refugees from Southeast Asia, and the second is predictable from general theories of migration.*

---

* Explanatory Note: The reported interstate migration figures shown in Table 10 were used to calculate rates of in-migration and out-migration for each State. The base population was taken to be the total resettlements in each State during the FY 1982, 1983, and 1984 period, since almost all of the reported migration pertains to this population. State A's in-migration rate was calculated by dividing its reported in-migrants by the total number of placements in all States except State A during the three-year period, while its out-migration rate was calculated by dividing the total out-migrants from State A by the total number of placements in State A during the three-year period. The migration rates calculated in this manner were then applied to the appropriate base populations, in order to calculate the revised population estimates.

In order to correct for reporting problems in several States and as a check against the accuracy of the estimates derived as explained above, ORR compared them with the most recent alternative available data on the distribution of the refugee population -- namely, the U.S. Department of Education's refugee child count of March 1984. That enumeration of refugee children was converted into a percentage distribution by State. This was compared with the percentage distribution calculated from the tentative ORR State refugee population estimates. Where the Education (ED) percentage distribution differed from the ORR percentage distribution by more than one-tenth of one percent (0.1%), this was interpreted as an indication of secondary migration requiring an adjustment in the ORR population estimate. The adjustment was made by calculating the mean of the two percentage distributions and taking that figure as the revised State share of the total. (Example: ORR percentage 4.13%; ED percentage 4.37%; mean 4.25%, which becomes the revised ORR estimate. However, the revisions were held to no closer than 0.1% to the ED percentage. If the ORR percentage was 4.13% and the ED percentage was 4.30%, the revision was 4.20%.) The adjusted percentage was then applied to the total refugee population, yielding a revised State population estimate. The population estimates for 27 States were adjusted in this way. Finally, small adjustments in the estimated refugee populations of several States were made based on information about recent migration flows documented by local or State officials that would not have been reflected in the existing data bases. The method used does not consider deaths or emigration, which are statistically rare among this population, or births of U.S. citizen children to refugee families.

## ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT

### Overview

The Refugee Act of 1980 and the Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982 both stress the achievement of economic self-sufficiency by refugees soon after their arrival in the United States. The achievement of economic self-sufficiency involves a balance among three elements: First, the employment potential of the refugees, including their skills, education, English language competence, health, and desire for work; second, the needs that they as individuals and members of families have for financial resources, whether for food, housing, or child-rearing; and third, the economic environment in which they settle, including the availability of jobs, housing, and other harder-to-measure resources.

Since the influx of Cuban refugees in the early 1960's, the economic adjustment of refugees to the United States has been a successful and generally rapid process. However, a variety of factors can influence the speed and completeness of refugees' striving toward economic self-sufficiency. Refugees often experience significant difficulties in reaching the United States and may arrive with a backlog of problems, such as personal health conditions, that require treatment before the refugee can effectively find work. Some refugees, for reasons of age or family responsibilities, cannot reasonably be expected to find work. In recent years it has become obvious that the general state of the American economy also has influence on this process. When jobs are not readily available, refugees -- even more than the general American population -- may be unable to find employment quickly even if they are relatively skilled and actively seek work. Finally, household size and composition are important, influencing the degree to which minimum wage jobs meet the requirements of families that can include several dependent children as well as dependent adults.

In sum, while the general pattern of refugee economic adjustment remains positive, a number of aspects, including both the characteristics of arriving refugees and changes in the American economy during the last few years, suggest that the adjustment process may have become more difficult than had previously been the case.

## Current Employment Status of Southeast Asian Refugees

In 1984, ORR completed its thirteenth survey of a national sample of Southeast Asian refugees, with data collected by Opportunity Systems, Inc. The sample included Southeast Asian refugees arriving from 1975 through 1984 and is the most recent and comprehensive data available on the economic adjustment of these refugees. The remaining parts of this section deal with the findings of this survey, conducted in October 1984, which included 1,244 refugee households.*

Results of the survey indicate a labor force participation rate of 55 percent for those in the sample aged 16 years and older as compared with 64 percent for the U.S. population as a whole. Of those in the labor force -- that is, those working or seeking work -- approximately 85 percent were employed as compared with 93 percent for the U.S. population. Overall refugee labor force participation was thus somewhat lower than for the general United States population, and the unemployment rate was higher.

---

* A technical description of the survey can be found on p. 98, following the text of this section.

These comparisons with the United States population are affected by the inclusion of numerous Southeast Asian refugees who have been in the country for only a short time. When employment status is considered separately by year of entry, the results indicate the relative success of earlier arrivals and the relative difficulties faced by more recent arrivals. Refugees arriving in 1984 had a labor force participation rate of 30 percent and an unemployment rate of 41 percent; those who had arrived in 1983 had a labor force participation rate of 42 percent and an unemployment rate of 36 percent. However, refugees who had arrived before 1979 participated in the labor force more frequently than did the general United States population, and their unemployment rates were lower than the U.S. rate of 7.0 percent.

A comparison of data from ORR's 1984 and two previous annual surveys underlines how refugee labor force participation rates increase with length of residence in the United States. Twenty-one percent of 1983 arrivals were in the labor force in October 1983, but this figure rose to 42 percent in the October 1984 survey. 1982 arrivals had a labor force participation rate of 25 percent in 1982 but a rate of 45 percent in 1984. The rate for 1981 arrivals rose from 42 percent in 1982 to 51 percent in 1984. For the total Southeast Asian refugee population, labor force participation has remained virtually the same over the past two years -- 56 percent in 1982 and 55 percent in 1983 and 1984. Gains in job seeking among recent arrivals have to some extent been offset by the slightly decreased numbers of secondary wage earners as earnings of employed refugees increase.

The data on unemployment rates also indicate significant progress in finding and retaining jobs. In October 1982, Southeast Asian refugees had an overall unemployment rate of 24 percent; by the October 1983 survey this figure had dropped to 18 percent. The October 1984 survey showed a further drop in refugee unemployment to 14.6%. The improvement in this area is particularly notable where examined by year of entry. For 1983 arrivals, unemployment decreased from 55 percent in 1983 to 36 percent in 1984; for 1982 arrivals, it decreased from 63 percent in 1982 to 13 percent in 1984.

Current Employment Status of Southeast Asian Refugees

| Year of Entry | Labor Force Participation | | | Unemployment | | | 1984 Response Rate** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | In 1982 | In 1983 | In 1984 | In 1982 | In 1983 | In 1984 | |
| 1984 | -- | -- | 30.0% | -- | -- | 41.0% | 77.6% |
| 1983 | -- | 20.7% | 41.6% | -- | 55.0% | 35.6% | 68.9% |
| 1982 | 25.2% | 40.9% | 45.4% | 62.5% | 30.4% | 12.5% | 55.8% |
| 1981 | 41.5% | 46.5% | 51.4% | 40.7% | 16.8% | 16.4% | 55.5% |
| 1980 | 51.3% | 55.3% | 54.5% | 32.1% | 21.1% | 11.6% | 48.6% |
| 1979 | 60.2% | 60.5% | 60.1% | 19.3% | 17.8% | 9.8% | 29.8% |
| 1978 | 67.6% | 68.2% | 66.2% | 19.0% | 19.7% | 2.6% | 34.7% |
| 1976-7 | 74.3% | 79.5% | 76.1% | 9.4% | 17.2% | 4.6% | 30.0% |
| 1975 | 72.1% | 69.7% | 67.3% | 12.7% | 12.1% | 6.3% | 35.8% |
| U.S. rates* | 64.1% | 64.1% | 64.6% | 9.9% | 8.4% | 7.0% | -- |

---

* October unadjusted figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

** Proportion of original sample of 2,700 successfully located and interviewed, by year of entry. The total number interviewed, 1,244, was 46.1 percent of the original sample. See Technical Note, p. 98.

The kinds of jobs that refugees find in the United States generally are of lower status than those they held in their country of origin. For example, 57 percent of those employed adults sampled had held white collar jobs in their country of origin; 30 percent hold similar jobs in the United States (as compared to 27 percent in last year's survey). Conversely, far more Southeast Asian refugees hold blue collar or service jobs in the U.S. than they did in their countries of origin. The survey data indicate, for example, a tripling of those in service occupations and of those in semi-skilled blue collar occupations.

Current and Previous Occupational Status

| Occupation | In Country of Origin | In U.S. |
|---|---|---|
| Professional/Managerial | 13.4% | 4.8% |
| Sales/Clerical | 43.1% | 24.8% |
| (TOTAL WHITE COLLAR) | (56.5%) | (29.6%) |
| Skilled | 10.8% | 19.8% |
| Semi-skilled | 5.5% | 22.3% |
| Laborers | 1.5% | 5.7% |
| (TOTAL BLUE COLLAR) | (17.8%) | (47.8%) |
| Service workers | 7.5% | 20.9% |
| Farmers and fishers | 18.2% | 1.6% |

## Factors Affecting Employment Status

The ability of Southeast Asian refugees to seek and find employment in the United States is the result of many factors. Some of these involve individual decisions about whether to seek work. As in previous surveys, respondents who were not in the labor force were asked why they were not seeking work. The reasons they gave varied by age and sex, but focused on the demands of family life, health problems, and the decisions to gain training and education preparatory to entering the job market.

For those under the age of 25, the pursuit of education was the overriding concern. For those between the ages of 25 and 44, family needs also became a major concern, and for those over the age of 44, health problems predominated as a reason for not seeking work. These factors have continued and in some cases gained in importance relative to other factors, as reasons for not seeking work for these age groups.

### Reasons for Not Seeking Employment*

Percent Citing:

| Age Group | Limited English | Education | Family Needs | Health | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16-24 | 5.3% | 85.9% | 3.7% | 0.9% | 4.2% |
| 25-34 | 9.9% | 29.5% | 34.1% | 4.7% | 21.8% |
| 35-44 | 14.4% | 23.8% | 25.5% | 6.0% | 30.3% |
| over 44 | 16.0% | 7.1% | 9.0% | 38.6% | 29.3% |

---

* The total of those not seeking work for the reasons cited above equals 100 percent for each age group when added across.

The major current refugee characteristic that influences successful involvement in the labor force is English language competence. As in previous surveys, English proficiency had clear effects on labor force participation, on unemployment rates, and on earnings. For those refugees in the sample who were fluent in English, the labor force participation and unemployment rates were similar to those for the overall United States population. Refugees who spoke no English, however, had a labor force participation rate of only 19.6 percent and an unemployment rate of 32 percent. Refugees who spoke a little English had a labor force participation rate of 55 percent and an unemployment rate of 19 percent.

Effects of English Language Proficiency

| Ability to Speak and Understand English | Labor Force Participation | Unemployment | Average* Weekly Wages |
|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all | 19.6% | 32.3% | $193.93 |
| A little | 55.3% | 18.5% | $197.14 |
| Well | 63.3% | 9.1% | $224.20 |
| Fluently | 64.4% | 4.4% | $275.19 |

---

* Of surveyed refugees who were employed.

## Achieving Economic Self-sufficiency

The achievement of economic self-sufficiency hinges on the mixture of refugee skills, refugee needs, job opportunities, and the resources available in the communities in which refugees resettle. The occupational and educational skills that refugees bring with them to the United States influence their prospects for self-sufficiency. Data from the 1984 survey indicate two modest changes in the characteristics of arriving Southeast Asian refugees since 1975: First, there is a sharp drop in educational level between 1975 and later arrivals, but relative similarity in prior education among all those arriving since 1975. 1975 arrivals had received, on the average, 9.5 years of formal education. For those arriving since 1975, the average number of years of education has remained about 7.5. Second, there appears to have been less English language competence at arrival among those entering the U.S. after 1977 than among those entering during 1975-1977. However, this pattern has been reversed by the apparently higher English skills of 1982, 1983, and particularly 1984 arrivals. This increased English language skill may reflect the provision of ESL training in refugee processing centers overseas. In fact, the percent of 1984 arrivals with no English speaking ability at all is 40 percent, virtually the same as that of the 1975 cohort.

## Background Characteristics by Year of Entry

| Year of Entry | Average Years of Education | Percent Speaking No English | Percent Speaking English Well or Fluently |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1984 | 7.4 | 40.3% | 9.2% |
| 1983 | 6.5 | 48.9% | 8.6% |
| 1982 | 7.0 | 54.7% | 4.9% |
| 1981 | 6.7 | 61.9% | 7.0% |
| 1980 | 7.0 | 67.6% | 6.9% |
| 1979 | 7.4 | 67.8% | 6.2% |
| 1978 | 7.3 | 54.3% | 18.6% |
| 1976-7 | 7.5 | 49.3% | 10.9% |
| 1975 | 9.4 | 40.6% | 27.2% |

---

Note: These figures refer to characteristics of incoming refugees at time of arrival in the United States and should not be confused with the current characteristics of these refugees. All figures are based on refugee responses in the 1984 survey.

Based on the survey findings, a series of aggregate characteristics of refugees were computed separately for differing lengths of residence in the U.S. The figures (detailed in the table on p. 99) show clear and continuing trends: Over time, labor force participation increases, unemployment decreases, and weekly income rises. Refugees with more than three years of residence in the United States have a labor force participation rate similar to that of the general United States population and an unemployment rate that, at 9 percent, is only two percentage points above the national average. Concurrently there is an increase in English language competence. Of those refugees in the country over 3 years, only 4 percent report no English language ability, and over two-thirds report the ability to speak English well or fluently. Enrollment in English language training drops over time, as does the receipt of cash assistance. One variable that does not exhibit such a trend is enrollment in other training or educational programs. Southeast Asian refugees continue to improve themselves through training and education long after their arrival in the U.S. Indeed, the data suggest that education and training may increase over time as refugees gain competence in English and more frequently and successfully participate in the labor force.

Working toward economic self-sufficiency is one part of a refugee's overall process of adjustment to the United States. But the achievement of economic self-sufficiency is complicated. An examination of the differences between refugee households who are receiving cash assistance and those not receiving cash assistance highlights the difficulties faced in becoming economically self-sufficient. Two factors deserve particular note: First, cash assistance recipient households are notably larger than non-recipient households, have fewer adult wage earners, and include a greater proportion of dependent children. Second, members of such households are less likely to have strong competence in English. Fewer than one in twenty recipient households, for example, included a fluent English speaker, while one in six non-recipient households did have a fluent English speaker.

Overall, findings from ORR's 1984 survey indicate, as in previous years, that refugees face significant problems on arrival in the United States, but that over time refugees increasingly seek and find jobs, and move toward economic self-sufficiency in their new country. This most recent survey continues to show the importance of English language competence to refugee economic progress and the frequency with which refugees seek English language training. The data further illustrate how Southeast Asian refugee employment is affected by changes in the U.S. economy.

---

Technical Note: The ORR Annual Survey, with interviews held between September 27 and November 17, 1984, was the thirteenth in a series conducted since 1975. It was designed to be representative of Southeast Asians who arrived as refugees between 1975 and April 30, 1984, the cutoff date for inclusion in the sample. Two sampling frames were used: The INS alien registration of January 1980 for persons arriving from 1975 through December 1979, and the ORR Master Data File for persons arriving from January 1980 through April 1984. A simple random sample of a size proportional to the number arriving during the time period covered was drawn from each frame. Initial contact was made by a letter in English and the refugee's native lanaguage, introducing the survey. If the person sampled was a child, an adult living in the same household was interviewed. Interviews were conducted by telephone in the refugee's native language by the staff of ORR's contractor, Opportunity Systems, Inc. The questionnaire and procedures used have been essentially the same since the 1981 survey.

The 1984 sample contained 2,700 persons including the 2,500 sampled in 1983, of whom 1,239 were interviewed in that year, and 200 new refugees selected from the cohort that arrived between May 1, 1983, and April 30, 1984. Actual contact was initiated in 1984 with 2,050 persons. The 1,239 refugees interviewed in 1983 were contacted again in 1984. Of the refugees sampled but not successfully interviewed in 1983, tracing activities were reopened for 611 for whom all leads had not been exhausted by the end of the survey period in 1983. (At the outset, 650 people were identified as impossible to locate, based on efforts in 1983 to trace them.) Contact was attempted with all 200 newly sampled refugees. By the end of the interviewing period in 1984, the contractor had interviewed 1,244 persons: 1,018 (82.2%) of the 1,239 from 1983, 76 (12.4%) of the 611 sampled but not located in 1983, and 150 (75.0%) of the new subsample of 200. The total of 1,244 interviews represents 46.1 percent of the original 2,700 sampled, or 60.7 percent of the 2,050 actually contacted in 1984. In future years, ORR will continue to conduct this survey as a panel study.

## Patterns in the Adjustment of Southeast Asian Refugees

### Length of Residence in Months

| | 0-6 | 7-12 | 13-18 | 19-24 | 25-30 | 31-36 | over 36 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Labor force participation | 30.0% | 38.5% | 37.6% | 45.2% | 48.0% | 42.4% | 74.4% |
| Unemployment | 48.6% | 35.5% | 35.9% | 19.4% | 12.7% | 17.7% | 9.0% |
| Weekly income of employed persons | $190.44 | $143.32 | $156.24 | $151.93 | $167.04 | $176.79 | $249.37 |
| Percent in English training | 28.5% | 43.0% | 45.8% | 18.3% | 22.0% | 20.4% | 11.1% |
| Percent in other training or schooling | 37.1% | 30.4% | 25.9% | 29.7% | 42.0% | 39.2% | 23.7% |
| Percent speaking English well or fluently* | 22.8% | 15.5% | 21.3% | 26.4% | 43.9% | 51.4% | 67.8% |
| Percent speaking no English* | 20.5% | 21.1% | 26.3% | 23.6% | 10.9% | 11.1% | 4.2% |
| Percent in households receiving cash assistance* | 70.1% | 74.1% | 61.6% | 52.8% | 44.6% | 57.0% | 38.8% |

---

Note: All except the asterisked items refer to the population aged sixteen and over. The asterisked items refer to the entire population.

## Comparison of Recipients and Non-recipients of Cash Assistance

| | Recipients | | Non-recipients | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1983 | 1984 | 1983 | 1984 |
| Average household size | 4.8 | 5.1 | 3.5 | 3.8 |
| Average number of wage-earners per household | 0.5 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.9 |
| Percent of household members: | | | | |
| Under the age of 6 | 13.2% | 21.1% | 8.2% | 19.2% |
| Under the age of 16 | 38.3% | 48.0% | 21.4% | 34.4% |
| Percent of households with at least one fluent English speaker | 4.7% | 3.6% | 19.9% | 15.9% |

## Incomes of Southeast Asian Refugees

Through an interagency agreement with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), ORR has obtained data on the incomes received and taxes paid by Southeast Asian refugees who arrived in the United States from 1975 through late 1979.* Tabulation of aggregated data on this group of refugees by IRS is possible because they were issued social security numbers in blocks through a special program in effect during that time. Data have been tabulated for tax years 1980, 1981, and 1982, and ORR expects to continue this data series in future years.

During the 1980-1982 period, the total incomes (before adjustments) reported by refugee tax-filing units rose, as did income from wages and from non-wage sources reported separately. The taxes paid by refugees increased at about the same rate. The median adjusted gross incomes of refugee tax filing units rose nearly 40 percent between 1980 and 1982. Detailed findings appear below:

### Incomes Received and Taxes Paid by Southeast Asian Refugees, 1980-1982**

| Tax Year | Total Income (millions) | Total Wage Income (millions) | Total Tax Liability (millions) | Median Adjusted Gross Income |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $ 880.4 | $ 766.8 | $ 86.6 | $6,539 |
| 1981 | $1,089.3 | $ 992.4 | $115.7 | $8,481 |
| 1982 | $1,200.7 | $1,010.9 | $114.9 | $9,119 |

---

* Tax information is maintained in confidence by the IRS; ORR receives only aggregate data.

** Refugees who arrived from 1975 through late 1979.

These data show that, despite a substantial increase over this time period, median refugee incomes remained below those of other residents. However, the upward trend provides a basis for optimism about future incomes. Trends in the components of income are also encouraging. For example, the number of tax returns with reported self-employment income grew from none in 1980 to 359 in 1982, when $2.9 million in self-employment income was reported. Income from dividends and interest also increased. Insured unemployment rose, showing the negative effect of the 1982 economic slowdown on the refugee population, but also indicating that an increasing number of refugees had been working in positions covered by unemployment compensation. Overall, these data show increasingly broad participation by the refugees in the U.S. economy.

## REFUGEE ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS AND CITIZENSHIP

### Adjustment of Status

Most refugees in the United States become eligible to adjust their immigration status to that of permanent resident alien after a waiting period of one year in the country. This provision, section 209 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980, applies to refugees of all nationalities. During FY 1984, 75,450 refugees adjusted their immigration status under this provision.

In addition, laws predating the Refugee Act provide for other groups of refugees (who entered the U.S. prior to enactment of the Refugee Act) to become permament resident aliens after waiting periods of various lengths. In FY 1984, 4,298 Southeast Asians adjusted their status under legislation pertaining specifically to them. This figure represents a 24-percent drop from the 5,671 who adjusted status under the same provision in FY 1983. In all, 229,510 Southeast Asians have become permanent resident aliens through this route since FY 1978, the first year that legislation was in effect. This represents more than two-thirds of the Southeast Asian refugees who entered before the Refugee Act of 1980 was enacted. The number of Cuban refugees adjusting status under the Cuban Refugee Adjustment Act of 1966 was 3,813 in FY 1984, a drop of 9 percent from the 4,202 of the previous year. Refugees from other nations are able to become permanent resident aliens after a two-year waiting period under P.L. 95-412 (legislation amending sections 201(a), 202(c), and 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes), which took effect October 5, 1978. Data from the Immigration and Naturalization Service indicate that 4,391 persons adjusted status under that law during FY 1984. (All figures cited in this section are tentative, based on workload statistics reported by INS. Official final figures have not been published.)

The Refugee Act also provides for the adjustment of status of a maximum of 5,000 aliens who have been granted political asylum and who have resided in the U.S. for at least one year after that. Tentative data for FY 1984 indicate that nearly 5,000 political asylees were granted permanent resident alien status during the year. This represents an increase over the total of 4,014 asylees whose status was adjusted in FY 1983.

Section 412(a)8 of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides that information supplied to INS by refugees at the time of their adjustment of status shall be compiled and summarized by ORR. Work to develop and refine the computer system for processing these records continued during FY 1984. The following discussion summarizes selected findings on the refugees who applied for adjustment of status in FY 1984. Of these refugees, ORR received and processed forms on 54,302 or approximately 72 percent of the refugees who became permanent resident aliens in FY 1984. The majority of these, 38,831, were persons aged 16 years or older; 55 percent were aged 18 to 44. The majority, 57 percent, were males.

The median month of arrival for these refugees was July 1982, and nearly two-thirds of them arrived in either 1982 or 1983. Only 6 percent arrived before 1980.

This group of refugees closely reflected the nationality composition of the refugees who arrived in FY 1982 and FY 1983. Approximately 70 percent were from Southeast Asia, which is nearly equal to their proportion of the refugees entering in FY 1982-1983 (71 percent).

Refugees from the Soviet Union are slightly overrepresented in this group: 6.1 percent, compared with 2.6 percent of the FY 1982-1983 entry cohort. The remaining 24 percent of these refugees represent the entire spectrum of nations from which refugees have been admitted in recent years, with numbers proportional to those of the population arriving in 1982-1983.

Most of the current States of residence of this refugee cohort approximate the known resettlement pattern and current distribution of the refugee population. However, some States are greatly underrepresented, which may indicate an uneven pattern of application for adjustment of status or inconsistencies in reporting. California accounted for nearly 40 percent of this refugee cohort, while New York was second with 13 percent. Other States contributing large numbers to this refugee cohort included Texas with 11 percent, and Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Washington State with about 4 percent each. States from which very few refugees were present in this cohort, probably due to underreporting, include Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, and Virginia, which together accounted for less than one-half of one percent.

Because the geographical coverage of this cohort of refugees applying for adjustment of status is not representative of the known refugee population, information on its current characteristics must be interpreted with caution. However, selected information on the refugees' backgrounds and current activities is available.

The refugees aged 16 and over were asked to describe their educational background before coming to the U.S. Of the nearly 31,000 responding, 8.5 percent reported themselves to be college graduates, and a total of 35 percent had at least a high school diploma. At the other end of the spectrum, 41 percent had an eighth grade education or less. Nearly 8 percent had earned some sort of technical certification.

Of the 21,623 refugees aged 16 or more who responded to a question on current education, 46 percent were attending some form of instruction, which may have included regular high school or college courses, technical or vocational training, or English language instruction. The younger the refugees, the more likely they were to be in school, but even 44 percent of those aged 25 or more reported receiving some form of current instruction.

Approximately 42 percent of the refugees aged 16 or more reported themselves to be currently employed. Of these, 84 percent were working full time and 16 percent held part-time positions. Information is not available on the extent to which this part-time employment represented the refugee's preference or whether it was the only choice available.

Specific current occupations were reported by 16,075 refugees aged 16 or more. The most commonly reported category was service occupations (26.8 percent), followed by benchwork occupations (18.3 percent), professional, technical, and managerial positions (12.1 percent), machine trades (10.2 percent), clerical and sales positions (9.8 percent), and structural work and related occupations (8.7 percent). Thus, a very wide spectrum of occupations was represented. The most commonly mentioned single occupations were food preparation and service (10.0 percent), building services (9.0 percent), textile and leather work (6.0 percent), metal machining (5.6 percent), and food processing (5.4 percent). Only 2.1 percent of the refugees were currently engaged in occupations in agriculture, forestry, and fisheries.

This occupational distribution represents a significant change from that reported by the refugees as their primary occupations in their countries of origin. Prior occupations were reported by 10,845 refugees; many others who are now adults were students or not of working age before becoming refugees. The most comonly reported category was professional, technical, and managerial positions (26.7 percent), followed by occupations in agriculture, forestry, and fisheries (15.5 percent), service occupations (13.6 percent), clerical and sales positions (11.4 percent), and benchwork occupations (10.2 percent). Among the most commonly citied occupations were farming (11.3 percent), "protective services," which includes the military, (9.0 percent), education (7.5 percent), and the health professions (5.8 percent). In the aggregate, these figures compared with the current occupations show a substantial movement out of two occupational categories: Professional work and farming. For different reasons, both of these types of employment would be difficult for refugees to resume in the United States.

## Citizenship

When refugees admitted under the Refugee Act of 1980 become permanent resident aliens, their official date of admission to the United States is established as the date on which they first arrived in the U.S. as refugees. After a waiting period of at least five years from that date, applications for naturalization are accepted from permanent resident aliens, provided that they have resided continuously in the U.S. and have met certain other requirements. The number of former refugees who have actually received citizenship lags behind the number who have become eligible at any time, since a substantial amount of time is necessary to complete the process. Data are not compiled on the number of naturalizations of former refugees as a distinct category of permanent resident aliens. However, the Immigration and Naturalization Service has reported that in FY 1980, the first year in which the 1975 arrivals became eligible for naturalization under the standard provisions, 705 persons who arrived in 1975 and who were born in Cambodia, Laos, or Vietnam were naturalized. In FY 1981, the number of persons naturalized from these three countries who had arrived in 1975 or 1976 was 8,654. Data for more recent years have not yet been released.

# IV. REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT IN PERSPECTIVE

In this section, the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) discusses his plans to improve the refugee program.*

## Refugee Admissions Levels

As Director of ORR, I am confident that the mechanisms are in place to provide for the immediate needs of those refugees who are admitted at the ceiling of 70,000 for FY 1985 which has been determined by the President following consultations with the Congress. This includes continuing to meet the needs, as warranted, of refugees already in the United States, particularly those who have been in this country three years or less, the period of full Federal responsibility for funding cash and medical assistance under the Refugee Act.

Our ability to accommodate the expected admission of new arrivals in FY 1985 is based on four observations of the current program:

1. The level of refugee admissions in FY 1984 and FY 1985 remains virtually constant, thereby stabilizing the flow of refugees into the United States.

2. At the beginning of FY 1985, the number of refugees included in the three-year "time-eligible" population decreased from previous years. At the beginning of FY 1984, the "time-eligible" population was approximately 317,000 refugees. At the beginning of FY 1985, the "time-eligible" population is 227,000 -- a decrease of 90,000 which will reduce the Federal expenditures for refugees as compared to the recent past.

---

* Updated from testimony presented to the Senate and House Judiciary Committees by Phillip N. Hawkes, Director of ORR, as part of the Congressional consultations on proposed refugee admissions for FY 1985.

3. States are generally well equipped to address the needs of the new arrivals. The State-administered refugee program and service system represents the culmination of an approximately ten-year period during which States -- many for the first time in recent American history -- assumed major resettlement responsibilities for hundreds of thousands of refugees, particularly Southeast Asians. Program structures were developed to accommodate high refugee flows which occurred during this period. Compared with peak flows totaling 145,000 in 1975 and 357,000 in 1980 (including 125,000 Cuban and 25,000 Haitian entrants), the proposed refugee admissions for 1985 will not be burdensome to States' existing administrative and program components.

4. A variety of Federal program initiatives, developed to increase the opportunities for refugee self-sufficiency, were implemented in FY 1984. We expect these efforts to be a force in the successful resettlement of refugees in FY 1985 and in future years.

Refugee Self-Sufficiency

On this fourth point, I would like to highlight briefly activities that we have undertaken during the past year to improve a refugee's prospects for self-sufficiency and social adjustment. Some of these initiatives are new starts; others are expansions of FY 1983 activities that became fully operational in FY 1984.

The Office of Refugee Resettlement remains steadfast in its commitment toward improving opportunities for refugees and entrants in securing permanent employment. Both social services and targeted assistance funds are available for employment-related services such as counseling, job placement, and vocational training. ORR has designated employment services as a high priority for social service expenditures -- over 65 percent of social service funds allocated to the States in FY 1983 and FY 1984 were used for this purpose.

In FY 1982, ORR provided impact aid to States experiencing the effect of the influx of Cuban and Haitian entrants. These funds permitted impacted areas to address the exceptional needs of this population. In FY 1983, $81 million was allocated as targeted assistance to local areas with high concentrations of refugees and entrants to enable these localities to address the employment needs of this population so that persistently high welfare utilization and unemployment would be reduced.

For FY 1984, additional targeted assistance funds were appropriated and these funds remain available for obligation through September 30, 1985. In order to assess the effectiveness of the program, an evaluation is currently under way which, when completed, will assist us in identifying those programs most effective in responding to the difficult problems of refugee unemployment and dependency existing in major resettlement areas.

We are enthusiastic about the outcome of demonstration projects intended to increase the number of wage earners in refugee and entrant households.

Our economic self-sufficiency thrust also includes a joint program initiative with the National Governors' Association (NGA) and an interagency agreement with the Small Business Administration (SBA). ORR with assistance from NGA is working with States to develop employment standards for refugee service providers which will allow us to measure better the effects of our employment services and strengthen the reliability of these services in terms of refugee needs and local employment conditions.

An interagency agreement with SBA is providing $400,000 in technical assistance funds to organizations which will focus on refugee business development in ten major refugee centers in the country. This agreement gives ORR the opportunity to leverage its resources to secure recognition for refugees as important clients of mainstream Federal agencies whose mission is to stimulate economic opportunities for special populations.

## Refugee Health

The health status of arriving refugees can have a profound bearing on their ability to function independently once they arrive in this country. The refugee health program is critical in protecting the health of American citizens as well as ensuring the physical well-being of the refugee.

During FY 1984, several measures were taken to strengthen the overseas medical screening program and to improve domestic followup. Examples include the following:

o Refugees leaving Vietnam under the Orderly Departure Program who have active tuberculosis are receiving treatment at the Refugee Processing Center in the Philippines prior to departure for the United States.

o Overseas screening activities for hepatitis B surface antigen among pregnant females and unaccompanied minors were revised and augmented.

o Medical and dental services for refugees were expanded at the Refugee Processing Center in the Philippines.

o Special initiatives were begun in areas such as mental health and health education.

o A cardiopulmonary resuscitation instructor training program was instituted for Lao/Hmong refugees in order to assist in preventing deaths from Sudden Unexplained Death Syndrome.

## Resettlement Initiatives

Throughout FY 1983 and 1984, ORR in conjunction with the Department of State continued to work closely with State and local officials and resettlement agencies in the identification of geographic areas throughout the country where employment opportunities coupled with a strong local economic base would make possible early self-sufficiency of resettled refugees. ORR has developed a three-pronged strategy in response to the problem of refugee resettlement into communities least able to provide for the employment and social needs of refugees:

First, the Favorable Alternative Sites Program (FASP) is an ongoing effort designed to identify resettlement sites, primarily for new arrivals, which are suitable alternatives to communities with unfavorable resettlement conditions.

Second, grants are being awarded under a Planned Secondary Resettlement Program (PSRP) directed to previously settled refugee groups who have found themselves in the grip of high welfare dependence with little chance of achieving self-sufficiency as a result of local conditions. The goal of this program equals the goal of the FASP program -- to develop alternative resettlement sites where refugees can earn a livelihood and establish themselves as contributing members of the local community.

Third, the Office of Refugee Resettlement prepared a proposed regulation which appeared for public comment in the December 1983 Federal Register that would establish definitions and procedures for deterring future placements of free-case refugees in highly impacted communities already incurring a disproportionate number of resettlements. ORR has consulted extensively on this proposal with the voluntary sector and State and local governments and is considering their views.

Successful refugee resettlement, of course, cannot be fully realized without the development and encouragement of effective refugee leadership and organization. In FY 1983, we provided an incentive to States to assist us with this objective by making funds available for those willing to commit some refugee program funds to refugee self-help organizations, usually known as mutual assistance associations (MAAs), as service providers. In FY 1984, we continued this initiative by making available special grants to States with the condition that such funds support the development and service activities of MAAs.

## Cash Assistance Use

The special initiatives that I have just outlined, combined with ongoing program efforts, are implemented with the single intent of enabling refugees to achieve economic self-sufficiency in the shortest time possible. In 1981, the dependency rate of refugees who had been in the U.S. less than three years was at a national high of 67 percent. As of September 1984, the dependency rate has somewhat stabilized at 54 percent compared to 53 percent in September 1983.

Referring to a single figure as the national dependency rate is misleading because there are four States with refugee dependency rates of less than 10 percent and one with a dependency rate of 85 percent. Further, there are 23 States with refugee dependency rates of less than 30 percent. A major factor which skews the national dependency rate is California, which at the end of FY 1984 had a State welfare dependency rate of 85 percent.

The national dependency rate has remained relatively constant over the past three years despite our attempts to work around it through special program initiatives such as FASP, PSRP, and now targeted assistance.

## Demonstration Projects

In October 1984, Congress passed an amendment to the Continuing Appropriations Resolution for FY 1985 which instructs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to "develop and implement alternative projects for refugees who have been in the United States less than 36 months, under which refugees are provided interim support, medical services, support services, and case management, as needed, in a manner that encourages self-sufficiency, reduces welfare dependency, and fosters greater coordination among the resettlement agencies and services providers...."

To encourage refugee self-sufficiency and to reduce welfare dependence, ORR plans to fund in FY 1985 demonstration projects which offer promising alternatives to current refugee cash and medical assistance strategies. Until recently, the prospects of reversing the extraordinary dependency of refugees on welfare in the State of California were minimal. Once refugees are on the AFDC program, they are outside the effective control of the Refugee Act and thus of ORR. However, California's Health and Welfare Agency has agreed to pursue a statewide demonstration project for refugees in which refugee cash assistance (RCA) would be the program of first resort for refugees who would otherwise qualify for AFDC or AFDC-UP. If this should occur, it would enable these refugees to utilize employment-related services and encourage refugee employment along with decreased reliance on assistance.

## Refugee Program Consultation

Likewise, the process of facilitating communication between Federal, State, and local officials and service providers, in addition to the refugee leadership, on the progress and problems of implementing the refugee resettlement program will ensure that appropriate responses are developed according to the real needs of the refugee population. In FY 1984, ORR continued to emphasize consultation among all parties concerned with refugee resettlement by hosting four regional consultation meetings in Atlanta, Denver, Philadelphia, and San Francisco. This consultation process was extremely successful in terms of incorporating the interests and concerns of over 800 participants. ORR is currently in the process of summarizing the recommendations made at the conferences along with our responses which will be synthesized into a final document for distribution to all participants.

# APPENDIX A

# TABLES

## TABLE 1

### Southeast Asian Refugee Arrivals in the United States: 1975 through September 30, 1984

| | |
|---|---|
| Resettled under Special Parole Program (1975) | 129,792 |
| Resettled under Humanitarian Parole Program (1975) | 602 |
| Resettled under Special Lao Program (1976) | 3,466 |
| Resettled under Expanded Parole Program (1976) | 11,000 |
| Resettled under "Boat Cases" Program as of August 1, 1977 | 1,883 |
| Resettled under Indochinese Parole Programs: | |
| August 1, 1977—September 30, 1977 | 680 |
| October 1, 1977—September 30, 1978 | 20,397 |
| October 1, 1978—September 30, 1979 | 80,678 |
| October 1, 1979—September 30, 1980 | 166,727 |
| Resettled under Refugee Act of 1980: | |
| October 1, 1980—September 30, 1981 | 132,454 |
| October 1, 1981—September 30, 1982 | 72,155 |
| October 1, 1982—September 30, 1983 | 39,167 |
| October 1, 1983—September 30, 1984 | 52,000 |
| TOTAL | 711,001 |

---

Prior to the passage of the Refugee Act of 1980, most Southeast Asian refugees entered the United States as "parolees" (refugees) under a series of parole authorizations granted by the Attorney General under the Immigration and Nationality Act. These parole authorizations are usually identified by the terms used in this table.

## TABLE 2

## Refugee Arrivals in the United States by Month: FY 1984

| Month | | Number of Arrivals | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Southeast Asians | All Others | Total |
| October | 2,961 | 401 | 3,362 |
| November | 4,400 | 1,275 | 5,675 |
| December | 3,495 | 1,792 | 5,287 |
| January | 3,729 | 1,339 | 5,068 |
| February | 4,202 | 1,385 | 5,587 |
| March | 4,947 | 1,916 | 6,863 |
| April | 3,501 | 1,544 | 5,045 |
| May | 3,058 | 1,914 | 4,972 |
| June | 7,024 | 1,587 | 8,611 |
| July | 3,628 | 1,539 | 5,167 |
| August | 5,885 | 1,947 | 7,832 |
| September | 5,170 | 1,952 | 7,122 |
| TOTAL | 52,000 | 18,591 | 70,591 |

---

FY 1984: October 1, 1983—September 30, 1984.

## TABLE 3

## Southeast Asian Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1984

| State | Country of Citizenship<br>Cambodia | Laos | Vietnam | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 96 | 43 | 145 | 284 |
| Alaska | 0 | 6 | 9 | 15 |
| Arizona | 159 | 40 | 419 | 618 |
| Arkansas | 9 | 54 | 104 | 167 |
| California | 5,202 | 2,211 | 9,305 | 16,718 |
| Colorado | 197 | 153 | 263 | 613 |
| Connecticut | 331 | 73 | 159 | 563 |
| Delaware | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| District of Columbia | 48 | 36 | 135 | 219 |
| Florida | 335 | 55 | 506 | 896 |
| Georgia | 566 | 100 | 472 | 1,138 |
| Hawaii | 24 | 82 | 185 | 291 |
| Idaho | 60 | 76 | 80 | 216 |
| Illinois | 907 | 273 | 671 | 1,851 |
| Indiana | 60 | 45 | 137 | 242 |
| Iowa | 161 | 190 | 197 | 548 |
| Kansas | 126 | 108 | 449 | 683 |
| Kentucky | 88 | 14 | 76 | 178 |
| Louisiana | 193 | 71 | 675 | 939 |
| Maine | 248 | 5 | 40 | 293 |
| Maryland | 444 | 66 | 398 | 908 |
| Massachusetts | 1,371 | 110 | 801 | 2,282 |
| Michigan | 77 | 85 | 299 | 461 |
| Minnesota | 635 | 500 | 498 | 1,633 |
| Mississippi | 0 | 9 | 99 | 108 |
| Missouri | 156 | 85 | 360 | 601 |
| Montana | 0 | 11 | 17 | 28 |
| Nebraska | 25 | 11 | 74 | 110 |
| Nevada | 67 | 24 | 173 | 264 |
| New Hampshire | 81 | 7 | 17 | 105 |
| New Jersey | 95 | 27 | 393 | 515 |
| New Mexico | 82 | 46 | 63 | 191 |
| New York | 843 | 135 | 1,152 | 2,130 |
| North Carolina | 326 | 77 | 143 | 546 |
| North Dakota | 30 | 7 | 30 | 67 |

| | Country of Citizenship | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| State | Cambodia | Laos | Vietnam | Total |
| Ohio | 532 | 90 | 227 | 849 |
| Oklahoma | 160 | 79 | 407 | 646 |
| Oregon | 273 | 215 | 465 | 953 |
| Pennsylvania | 866 | 130 | 660 | 1,656 |
| Rhode Island | 341 | 148 | 42 | 531 |
| South Carolina | 35 | 26 | 49 | 110 |
| South Dakota | 0 | 16 | 21 | 37 |
| Tennessee | 303 | 134 | 124 | 561 |
| Texas | 1,525 | 512 | 2,473 | 4,510 |
| Utah | 455 | 78 | 325 | 858 |
| Vermont | 77 | 14 | 14 | 105 |
| Virginia | 781 | 151 | 632 | 1,564 |
| Washington | 1,405 | 451 | 787 | 2,643 |
| West Virginia | 5 | 2 | 10 | 17 |
| Wisconsin | 49 | 343 | 107 | 499 |
| Wyoming | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| Guam | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 19,849 | 7,224 | 24,927 | 52,000 |

## TABLE 4

## Eastern European and Soviet Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1984

| State | Czechoslovakia | Hungary | Poland | Romania | USSR | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Country of Citizenship | | | | | |
| Alabama | 4 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 15 |
| Alaska | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 11 |
| Arizona | 1 | 0 | 33 | 39 | 0 | 73 |
| Arkansas | 4 | 1 | 32 | 1 | 1 | 39 |
| California | 162 | 95 | 543 | 1,167 | 183 | 2,150 |
| Colorado | 21 | 5 | 29 | 19 | 5 | 79 |
| Connecticut | 11 | 45 | 166 | 88 | 6 | 316 |
| Delaware | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| District of Columbia | 11 | 8 | 30 | 7 | 1 | 57 |
| Florida | 18 | 30 | 121 | 78 | 19 | 266 |
| Georgia | 4 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 26 |
| Hawaii | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Idaho | 48 | 0 | 110 | 18 | 0 | 176 |
| Illinois | 38 | 15 | 371 | 590 | 31 | 1,045 |
| Indiana | 2 | 3 | 31 | 25 | 1 | 62 |
| Iowa | 1 | 6 | 36 | 2 | 0 | 45 |
| Kansas | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 15 |
| Kentucky | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 16 |
| Louisiana | 4 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Maine | 4 | 1 | 77 | 0 | 3 | 85 |
| Maryland | 20 | 21 | 83 | 53 | 3 | 180 |
| Massachusetts | 75 | 5 | 49 | 29 | 35 | 193 |
| Michigan | 6 | 5 | 215 | 201 | 5 | 432 |
| Minnesota | 6 | 6 | 64 | 46 | 6 | 128 |
| Mississippi | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Missouri | 17 | 25 | 97 | 42 | 2 | 183 |
| Montana | 4 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 16 |
| Nebraska | 13 | 0 | 28 | 4 | 0 | 45 |
| Nevada | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 17 |
| New Hampshire | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 11 |
| New Jersey | 25 | 21 | 167 | 92 | 26 | 331 |
| New Mexico | 2 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 16 |
| New York | 106 | 100 | 782 | 958 | 346 | 2,292 |
| North Carolina | 8 | 5 | 16 | 11 | 0 | 40 |
| North Dakota | 21 | 7 | 30 | 50 | 0 | 108 |

| | Country of Citizenship | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| State | Czechoslovakia | Hungary | Poland | Romania | USSR | Total |
| Ohio | 16 | 39 | 25 | 163 | 5 | 248 |
| Oklahoma | 3 | 1 | 14 | 17 | 0 | 35 |
| Oregon | 4 | 0 | 7 | 158 | 0 | 169 |
| Pennsylvania | 20 | 27 | 176 | 60 | 20 | 303 |
| Rhode Island | 0 | 2 | 25 | 2 | 1 | 30 |
| South Carolina | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 12 |
| South Dakota | 9 | 7 | 28 | 20 | 0 | 64 |
| Tennessee | 5 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 22 |
| Texas | 52 | 27 | 243 | 157 | 19 | 498 |
| Utah | 35 | 0 | 63 | 21 | 3 | 122 |
| Vermont | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
| Virginia | 9 | 3 | 22 | 12 | 2 | 48 |
| Washington | 17 | 13 | 113 | 33 | 1 | 177 |
| West Virginia | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Wisconsin | 5 | 1 | 27 | 1 | 4 | 38 |
| Wyoming | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Guam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 822 | 533 | 3,942 | 4,244 | 732 | 10,273 |

## TABLE 5

## Ethiopian and Near Eastern Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1984

|  | Country of Citizenship |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| State | Ethiopia | Afghanistan | Iran | Iraq | Total |
| Alabama | 26 | 17 | 10 | 0 | 53 |
| Alaska | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Arizona | 108 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 118 |
| Arkansas | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| California | 453 | 673 | 1,285 | 24 | 2,435 |
| Colorado | 34 | 16 | 23 | 0 | 73 |
| Connecticut | 11 | 8 | 29 | 0 | 48 |
| Delaware | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| District of Columbia | 134 | 28 | 22 | 0 | 184 |
| Florida | 66 | 32 | 68 | 0 | 166 |
| Georgia | 78 | 30 | 74 | 0 | 182 |
| Hawaii | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Idaho | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 9 |
| Illinois | 114 | 56 | 103 | 47 | 320 |
| Indiana | 11 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 30 |
| Iowa | 6 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 22 |
| Kansas | 3 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 23 |
| Kentucky | 29 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 50 |
| Louisiana | 7 | 15 | 11 | 0 | 33 |
| Maine | 0 | 63 | 5 | 0 | 68 |
| Maryland | 129 | 40 | 141 | 1 | 311 |
| Massachusetts | 69 | 10 | 48 | 1 | 128 |
| Michigan | 32 | 15 | 21 | 63 | 131 |
| Minnesota | 49 | 22 | 28 | 0 | 99 |
| Mississippi | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 8 |
| Missouri | 112 | 15 | 28 | 0 | 155 |
| Montana | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Nebraska | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Nevada | 45 | 31 | 27 | 0 | 103 |
| New Hampshire | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| New Jersey | 46 | 54 | 80 | 0 | 180 |
| New Mexico | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| New York | 175 | 369 | 218 | 2 | 764 |
| North Carolina | 21 | 16 | 8 | 0 | 45 |
| North Dakota | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 18 |

## Country of Citizenship

| State | Ethiopia | Afghanistan | Iran | Iraq | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ohio | 56 | 5 | 24 | 1 | 86 |
| Oklahoma | 13 | 5 | 44 | 0 | 62 |
| Oregon | 9 | 10 | 22 | 0 | 41 |
| Pennsylvania | 107 | 18 | 34 | 0 | 159 |
| Rhode Island | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 11 |
| South Carolina | 2 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 11 |
| South Dakota | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Tennessee | 29 | 6 | 20 | 6 | 61 |
| Texas | 321 | 56 | 217 | 9 | 603 |
| Utah | 1 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 23 |
| Vermont | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Virginia | 58 | 271 | 71 | 4 | 404 |
| Washington | 90 | 31 | 43 | 2 | 166 |
| West Virginia | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Wisconsin | 16 | 2 | 23 | 0 | 41 |
| Wyoming | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Guam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 2,508 | 2,020 | 2,839 | 161 | 7,528 |

## TABLE 6

## Total Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1984

| State | Total Arrivals | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 353 | 0.5% |
| Alaska | 27 | a/ |
| Arizona | 829 | 1.2 |
| Arkansas | 213 | 0.3 |
| California | 21,483 | 30.4 |
| Colorado | 770 | 1.1 |
| Connecticut | 945 | 1.3 |
| Delaware | 19 | a/ |
| District of Columbia | 471 | 0.7 |
| Florida | 1,386 | 2.0 |
| Georgia | 1,359 | 1.9 |
| Hawaii | 304 | 0.4 |
| Idaho | 402 | 0.6 |
| Illinois | 3,307 | 4.7 |
| Indiana | 335 | 0.5 |
| Iowa | 617 | 0.9 |
| Kansas | 724 | 1.0 |
| Kentucky | 245 | 0.3 |
| Louisiana | 991 | 1.4 |
| Maine | 448 | 0.6 |
| Maryland | 1,413 | 2.0 |
| Massachusetts | 2,612 | 3.7 |
| Michigan | 1,033 | 1.5 |
| Minnesota | 1,869 | 2.6 |
| Mississippi | 121 | 0.2 |
| Missouri | 970 | 1.4 |
| Montana | 49 | a/ |
| Nebraska | 198 | 0.3 |
| Nevada | 385 | 0.5 |
| New Hampshire | 117 | 0.2 |
| New Jersey | 1,052 | 1.5 |
| New Mexico | 214 | 0.3 |
| New York | 5,303 | 7.5 |
| North Carolina | 637 | 0.9 |
| North Dakota | 197 | 0.3 |

| State | Total Arrivals | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Ohio | 1,188 | 1.7 |
| Oklahoma | 746 | 1.1 |
| Oregon | 1,169 | 1.7 |
| Pennsylvania | 2,163 | 3.1 |
| Rhode Island | 576 | 0.8 |
| South Carolina | 133 | 0.2 |
| South Dakota | 134 | 0.2 |
| Tennessee | 646 | 0.9 |
| Texas | 5,643 | 8.0 |
| Utah | 1,007 | 1.4 |
| Vermont | 115 | 0.2 |
| Virginia | 2,027 | 2.9 |
| Washington | 3,002 | 4.3 |
| West Virginia | 22 | a/ |
| Wisconsin | 586 | 0.8 |
| Wyoming | 19 | a/ |
| Guam | 16 | a/ |
| Other | 1 | a/ |
| TOTAL | 70,591 | 100.0% |

---

a/ Less than 0.1 percent.

## TABLE 7

### Applications for Refugee Status Granted by INS: FY 1980 - FY 1984[a]

| Country of Chargeability | FY 1980 | FY 1981 | FY 1982 | FY 1983 | FY 1984 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | 671 | 4,456 | 3,425 | 2,896 | 2,268 | 13,716 |
| Albania | 7 | 28 | 14 | 69 | 48 | 166 |
| Angola | 0 | 175 | 111 | 10 | 84 | 380 |
| Bulgaria | 62 | 116 | 140 | 136 | 140 | 594 |
| Cambodia | 8,809 | 38,194 | 6,246 | 22,399 | 21,444 | 97,092 |
| China | 724 | 324 | 8 | 29 | 30 | 1,115 |
| Cuba | 1,784 | 1,208 | 580 | 710 | 57 | 4,339 |
| Cyprus | 20 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Czechoslovakia | 502 | 1,251 | 811 | 1,297 | 859 | 4,720 |
| Egypt | 51 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 120 |
| El Salvador | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 96 |
| Ethiopia | 939 | 3,513 | 4,019 | 2,592 | 2,536 | 13,599 |
| Greece | 178 | 243 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 421 |
| Hong Kong | 171 | 827 | 189 | 90 | 137 | 1,414 |
| Hungary | 189 | 441 | 410 | 656 | 548 | 2,244 |
| India | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 10 |
| Iran | 184 | 358 | 0 | 947 | 2,969 | 4,458 |
| Iraq | 861 | 1,220 | 2,025 | 1,588 | 157 | 5,851 |
| Laos | 24,310 | 19,777 | 3,616 | 5,627 | 8,189 | 61,519 |
| Lebanon | 239 | 203 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 442 |
| Lesotho | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 |
| Macau | 18 | 52 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 80 |
| Malawi | 0 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 14 | 33 |
| Mozambique | 0 | 17 | 6 | 11 | 27 | 61 |
| Namibia | 0 | 28 | 15 | 3 | 21 | 67 |
| Nicaragua | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Pakistan | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 10 |
| Philippines | 0 | 4 | 23 | 42 | 17 | 86 |
| Poland | 387 | 1,995 | 6,599 | 5,820 | 4,288 | 19,089 |
| Romania | 1,549 | 3,075 | 2,982 | 3,991 | 4,301 | 15,898 |
| Sao Tome | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| South Africa | 0 | 13 | 11 | 14 | 12 | 50 |
| Sudan | 2 | 13 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Syria | 309 | 378 | 40 | 4 | 5 | 736 |
| Turkey | 309 | 411 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 720 |
| USSR | 8,136 | 11,151 | 2,820 | 1,407 | 721 | 24,235 |
| Uganda | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Vietnam | 31,260 | 65,279 | 27,396 | 23,287 | 28,875 | 176,097 |
| Yugoslavia | 11 | 30 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 61 |
| Zaire | 0 | 14 | 10 | 11 | 34 | 69 |
| All Others | 131 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 274 |
| TOTAL | 81,814 | 155,031 | 61,527 | 73,645 | 77,932 | 449,949 |

---

[a] Approvals under P.L. 96-212, section 207, which took effect April 1, 1980. Numbers approved during a year will differ slightly from the numbers actually entering during that year.

Source: Immigration and Naturalization Service, unpublished tabulations.

## TABLE 8

### Asylum Applications Approved: FY 1980 - FY 1984

| Country of Nationality | FY 1980 | FY 1981 | FY 1982 | FY 1983 | FY 1984 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | 208 | 201 | 332 | 53 | 268 | 1,062 |
| Angola | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Argentina | 20 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 23 |
| Bulgaria | 6 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 19 | 34 |
| Burundi | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Cambodia | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
| Cameroon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Chile | 4 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 13 |
| China | 6 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 16 | 50 |
| Columbia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Cuba | 72 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 103 |
| Czechoslovakia | 23 | 7 | 13 | 7 | 51 | 101 |
| Ecuador | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Egypt | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| El Salvador | 0 | 2 | 74 | 71 | 503 | 650 |
| Ethiopia | 154 | 174 | 249 | 67 | 361 | 1,005 |
| France | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| German Democratic Republic | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 20 |
| Ghana | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 24 |
| Guatemala | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 |
| Guyana | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| Haiti | 2 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 37 | 53 |
| Honduras | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 |
| Hungary | 39 | 21 | 25 | 7 | 82 | 174 |
| Indonesia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Iran | 14 | 120 | 2,624 | 1,760 | 7,442 | 11,960 |
| Iraq | 43 | 37 | 21 | 4 | 46 | 151 |
| Ireland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Israel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Jordan | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Kenya | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Korea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Laos | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 16 |
| Lebanon | 4 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 19 | 40 |
| Liberia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 14 |
| Libya | 3 | 39 | 23 | 5 | 17 | 87 |
| Malawi | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Mexico | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Mozambique | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

| Country of Nationality | FY 1980 | FY 1981 | FY 1982 | FY 1983 | FY 1984 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Namibia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Nicaragua | 3 | 297 | 336 | 94 | 1,153 | 1,883 |
| Pakistan | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 19 |
| Peru | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Philippines | 19 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 53 | 85 |
| Poland | 243 | 90 | 102 | 261 | 953 | 1,649 |
| Rhodesia | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Romania | 65 | 33 | 69 | 38 | 192 | 397 |
| Seychelles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| Sierra Leone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Singapore | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Somalia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 35 | 37 |
| South Africa | 25 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 44 |
| Syria | 0 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 36 | 58 |
| Taiwan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Thailand | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Turkey | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| USSR | 15 | 4 | 14 | 18 | 70 | 121 |
| Uganda | 36 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 72 | 138 |
| Uruguay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Vietnam | 16 | 10 | 14 | 10 | 25 | 75 |
| Yugoslavia | 8 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 20 | 39 |
| Zaire | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 |
| All Others | 55 | 67 | 68 | 1 | 0 | 191 |
| TOTAL | 1,104 | 1,179 | 4,045 | 2,479 | 11,627 | 20,434 |

---

Source: Immigration and Naturalization Service, unpublished tabulations.

## TABLE 9

### Estimated Southeast Asian Refugee Population by State: September 30, 1983 and September 30, 1984[a]

| State | 9/30/83 | 9/30/84 | 9/30/84 Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 2,300 | 2,600 | 0.4% |
| Alaska | 200 | 200 | c/ |
| Arizona | 4,600 | 4,300 | 0.6 |
| Arkansas | 2,900 | 2,300 | 0.3 |
| California | 244,200 | 285,100 | 40.1 |
| Colorado | 10,100 | 10,700 | 1.5 |
| Connecticut | 6,000 | 6,600 | 0.9 |
| Delaware | 300 | 300 | c/ |
| District of Columbia | 1,100 | 1,400 | 0.2 |
| Florida | 11,700 | 11,500 | 1.6 |
| Georgia | 7,800 | 8,300 | 1.2 |
| Hawaii | 6,800 | 6,200 | 0.9 |
| Idaho | 1,300 | 1,300 | 0.2 |
| Illinois | 23,500 | 23,400 | 3.3 |
| Indiana | 4,200 | 3,800 | 0.5 |
| Iowa | 8,100 | 8,300 | 1.2 |
| Kansas | 8,700 | 9,400 | 1.3 |
| Kentucky | 2,300 | 2,000 | 0.3 |
| Louisiana | 13,300 | 13,500 | 1.9 |
| Maine | 1,300 | 1,600 | 0.2 |
| Maryland | 7,300 | 8,500 | 1.2 |
| Massachusetts | 15,400 | 19,300 | 2.7 |
| Michigan | 10,000 | 10,000 | 1.4 |
| Minnesota | 21,000 | 22,600 | 3.2 |
| Mississippi | 1,500 | 1,700 | 0.2 |
| Missouri | 6,200 | 6,200 | 0.9 |
| Montana | 1,000 | 800 | 0.1 |
| Nebraska | 2,300 | 1,900 | 0.3 |
| Nevada | 1,900 | 1,900 | 0.3 |
| New Hampshire | 600 | 700 | c/ |
| New Jersey | 5,900 | 6,300 | 0.9 |
| New Mexico | 2,400 | 1,800 | 0.3 |
| New York | 22,700 | 24,800 | 3.5 |
| North Carolina | 4,800 | 5,000 | 0.7 |
| North Dakota | 800 | 800 | 0.1 |
| Ohio | 9,800 | 9,600 | 1.4 |
| Oklahoma | 8,500 | 8,200 | 1.2 |
| Oregon | 16,200 | 17,200 | 2.4 |

| State | 9/30/83 | 9/30/84 | 9/30/84 Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pennsylvania | 23,000 | 23,900 | 3.4 |
| Rhode Island | 6,200 | 5,100 | 0.7 |
| South Carolina | 2,400 | 2,100 | 0.3 |
| South Dakota | 1,000 | 900 | 0.1 |
| Tennessee | 4,100 | 4,500 | 0.6 |
| Texas | 53,600 | 51,300 | 7.2 |
| Utah | 7,900 | 7,800 | 1.1 |
| Vermont | 500 | 600 | c/ |
| Virginia | 20,300 | 21,000 | 3.0 |
| Washington | 30,400 | 32,600 | 4.6 |
| West Virginia | 500 | 400 | c/ |
| Wisconsin | 9,600 | 10,300 | 1.5 |
| Wyoming | 300 | 200 | c/ |
| Guam | 200 | 200 | c/ |
| Other Territories | b/ | b/ | c/ |
| TOTAL | 659,000 | 711,000 | 100.0% |

---

a/ The September 1983 estimates were constructed by taking the January 1981 INS alien registration, adjusting it for underregistration, adding persons who arrived from January 1981 through September 1983, and adjusting the totals so derived for secondary migration. The September 1984 estimates were constructed similarly by using the known distribution of the population in January 1981, adding arrivals from January 1981 through September 1984, and adjusting those totals for secondary migration. Estimates of secondary migration rates were developed from data submitted by the States. Figures are rounded to the nearest hundred and may not add to totals due to rounding. No adjustments have been made for births and deaths among the refugee population. Percentages are calculated from unrounded data.

b/ Less than 50.

c/ Less than 0.1 percent.

## TABLE 10

### Secondary Migration Data Compiled from the Refugee State-of-Origin Report: June 30, 1984a/

| State | Non-Movers | Out-Migrants | In-Migrants | Net Migration |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | c/ | 351 | 550 | 199 |
| Alaska b/ | 0 | 130 | 0 | -130 |
| Arizona | 600 | 870 | 48 | -822 |
| Arkansas | 55 | 300 | 20 | -280 |
| California | 50,994 | 1,566 | 21,677 | 20,111 |
| Colorado | 1,253 | 481 | 494 | 13 |
| Connecticut | 614 | 304 | 83 | -221 |
| Delaware | 23 | 18 | 1 | -17 |
| District of Columbia | 72 | 1,149 | 17 | -1,132 |
| Florida | 835 | 1,040 | 139 | -901 |
| Georgia | 949 | 917 | 212 | -705 |
| Hawaii | 926 | 326 | 77 | -249 |
| Idaho | 108 | 230 | 26 | -204 |
| Illinois | 1,789 | 1,802 | 245 | -1,557 |
| Indiana | 154 | 281 | 0 | -281 |
| Iowa | 633 | 404 | 80 | -324 |
| Kansas | 913 | 627 | 362 | -265 |
| Kentucky | 168 | 562 | 15 | -547 |
| Louisiana | 485 | 704 | 140 | -564 |
| Maine | 357 | 87 | 23 | -64 |
| Maryland | 1,169 | 401 | 877 | 476 |
| Massachusetts | 5,324 | 625 | 1,191 | 566 |
| Michigan | 1,150 | 529 | 149 | -380 |
| Minnesota | 3,389 | 937 | 630 | -307 |
| Mississippi | 44 | 163 | 29 | -134 |
| Missouri | 695 | 740 | 130 | -610 |
| Montana | 40 | 43 | 1 | -42 |
| Nebraska | 144 | 411 | 33 | -378 |
| Nevada | 216 | 259 | 24 | -235 |
| New Hampshire | 47 | 50 | 1 | -49 |
| New Jersey | 809 | 503 | 214 | -289 |
| New Mexico | 196 | 538 | 50 | -488 |
| New York | c/ | 2,058 | 2,444 | 386 |
| North Carolina | 178 | 490 | 38 | -452 |
| North Dakota | 181 | 131 | 5 | -126 |
| Ohio | 1,169 | 828 | 124 | -704 |
| Oklahoma | 257 | 719 | 53 | -666 |
| Oregon | 2,498 | 1,345 | 490 | -855 |

| State | Non-Movers | Out-Migrants | In-Migrants | Net Migration |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pennsylvania | 4,494 | 1,379 | 684 | -695 |
| Rhode Island | 470 | 372 | 249 | -123 |
| South Carolina | 53 | 186 | 4 | -182 |
| South Dakota | 74 | 79 | 5 | -74 |
| Tennessee | 390 | 471 | 11 | -460 |
| Texas | 3,265 | 5,030 | 611 | -4,419 |
| Utah | 802 | 802 | 85 | -717 |
| Vermont | 73 | 46 | 15 | -31 |
| Virginia | 1,648 | 1,059 | 601 | -458 |
| Washington | 4,538 | 1,567 | 1,271 | -296 |
| West Virginia | 17 | 58 | 2 | -56 |
| Wisconsin | 344 | 227 | 187 | -40 |
| Wyoming | 12 | 37 | 5 | -32 |
| Guam | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other b/ | 0 | 190 | 0 | -190 |
| TOTAL | 94,622 | 34,422 | 34,422 | 0 |

---

a/ This table represents a compilation of data reported by the States on Form ORR-11. The population base is refugees receiving State-administered services on 6/30/84. Persons without social security numbers were dropped from the analysis. Secondary migration is defined as a change of residence across a State line at any time between initial arrival in the U.S. and the reporting date. With regard to any given State, out-migrants are persons initially placed there who were living elsewhere on the reporting date, and in-migrants are persons living there on the reporting date who were initially placed elsewhere.

b/ Not participating in the refugee program.

c/ State did not report on its entire caseload.

## TABLE 11

## Receipt of Cash Assistance by Refugee Nationality: June 30, 1984

| State | Country of Nationality | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Cambodia | Laos | Vietnam | USSR | Poland | Other East Europe | Cuba | Afghanistan | Iraq | Ethiopia | Other | Total |
| Alabama | 80 | 7 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 243 |
| Arizona | 137 | 35 | 278 | 0 | 15 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 22 | 574 |
| Arkansas | 11 | 29 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| California | 11,617 | 7,654 | 43,312 | 1,236 | 642 | 1,860 | 364 | 1,279 | 310 | 590 | 2,576 | 71,440 |
| Colorado | 268 | 98 | 422 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 43 | 7 | 14 | 5 | 876 |
| Connecticut | 269 | 97 | 244 | 16 | 65 | 56 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 13 | 6 | 783 |
| Delaware | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 26 |
| District of Columbia | 4 | 1 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 39 | 8 | 96 |
| Florida a/ | 0 | 0 | 741 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 1,054 |
| Georgia | 391 | 73 | 320 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 20 | 844 |
| Hawaii | 48 | 245 | 599 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 942 |
| Idaho | 11 | 22 | 58 | 0 | 34 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 178 |
| Illinois | 1,292 | 461 | 1,243 | 145 | 273 | 283 | 114 | 64 | 51 | 145 | 615 | 4,686 |
| Indiana | 51 | 3 | 38 | 8 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 154 |
| Iowa | 145 | 282 | 196 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 653 |
| Kansas | 119 | 236 | 1,399 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 1,778 |
| Kentucky | 85 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 184 |
| Louisiana | 33 | 44 | 620 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 701 |
| Maine | 257 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 380 |
| Maryland | 520 | 113 | 630 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 21 | 55 | 18 | 57 | 17 | 1,453 |
| Massachusetts | 2,418 | 356 | 2,347 | 56 | 0 | 92 | 58 | 22 | 0 | 60 | 269 | 5,678 |
| Michigan | 86 | 138 | 479 | 13 | 127 | 131 | 0 | 6 | 589 | 16 | 29 | 1.614 |
| Minnesota | 1,330 | 1,035 | 1,344 | 12 | 80 | 45 | 0 | 36 | 9 | 91 | 34 | 4,016 |
| Mississippi | 0 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 |
| Missouri a/ | 0 | 0 | 851 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 1,095 |
| Montana | 0 | 19 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 49 |
| Nebraska | 21 | 18 | 107 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 208 |
| Nevada | 46 | 9 | 83 | 0 | 10 | 32 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 240 |
| New Hampshire | 39 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| New Jersey | 72 | 35 | 594 | 21 | 101 | 14 | 37 | 130 | 0 | 24 | 30 | 1,058 |
| New Mexico | 38 | 40 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 278 |
| New York b/ | 690 | 207 | 1,519 | 346 | 1,175 | 1,589 | 0 | 622 | 276 | 276 | 207 | 6,907 |
| North Carolina | 106 | 18 | 78 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 222 |
| North Dakota | 39 | 18 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 78 |
| Ohio | 518 | 172 | 252 | 5 | 29 | 66 | 10 | 9 | 6 | 79 | 157 | 1,303 |
| Oklahoma | 109 | 27 | 238 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 388 |
| Oregon | 523 | 401 | 1,307 | 0 | 0 | 172 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 26 | 169 | 2,616 |

| State | Cambodia | Laos | Vietnam | USSR | Poland | Other East Europe | Cuba | Afghanistan | Iraq | Ethiopia | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pennsylvania | 1,056 | 625 | 2,708 | 182 | 52 | 43 | 107 | 53 | 0 | 108 | 66 | 5,000 |
| Rhode Island | 671 | 196 | 82 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 967 |
| South Carolina | 21 | 2 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| South Dakota | 3 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 0 | 60 |
| Tennessee | 109 | 74 | 124 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 346 |
| Texas a/ | 0 | 0 | 2,884 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 28 | 9 | 43 | 81 | 3,063 |
| Utah | 312 | 45 | 250 | 0 | 28 | 11 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 794 |
| Vermont | 82 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| Virginia | 483 | 217 | 1,197 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 332 | 0 | 62 | 9 | 2,336 |
| Washington | 1,900 | 756 | 2,124 | 0 | 389 | 112 | 0 | 57 | 28 | 167 | 54 | 5,587 |
| West Virginia | 2 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Wisconsin | 105 | 362 | 147 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 700 |
| Wyoming | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Guam | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| TOTAL | 26,117 | 14,224 | 69,421 | 2,142 | 3,167 | 4,680 | 972 | 3,036 | 1,339 | 2,125 | 4,884 | 132,107 |
| Percent | 19.77 | 10.77 | 52.55 | 1.62 | 2.40 | 3.54 | .74 | 2.30 | 1.01 | 1.61 | 3.70 | 100.00 |

---

a/ State reported Southeast Asians as one category; ORR recorded them as Vietnamese.

b/ Partially estimated.

## TABLE 12

### States with Largest School Enrollments of Refugee Children: March 1984 a/

| State | Refugee Children | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| California | 29,601 | 31.5% |
| Texas | 6,394 | 6.8 |
| Florida | 4,706 | 5.0 |
| Massachusetts | 4,125 | 4.4 |
| Illinois | 4,101 | 4.4 |
| New York | 4,043 | 4.3 |
| Pennsylvania | 3,710 | 4.0 |
| Virginia | 3,657 | 3.9 |
| Washington | 3,473 | 3.7 |
| Rhode Island | 2,281 | 2.4 |
| Minnesota | 2,252 | 2.4 |
| Oregon | 1,857 | 2.0 |
| All Others | 23,720 | 25.3 |
| TOTAL | 93,920 | 100.0% |
| **By Levels** | | |
| Elementary | 40,778 | 43.4 |
| Secondary | 53,142 | 56.6 |
| **By Groups** | | |
| Southeast Asian children | 74,597 | 79.4 |
| All other children | 19,323 | 20.6 |

---

a/ Elementary school children are counted if they have been in the U.S. for less than two years; secondary school children if they have been in the U.S. for less than three years.

Source: U.S. Department of Education

## TABLE 13

### Placement and Status of Southeast Asian Unaccompanied Minor Refugees by State and Sponsoring Agency: a/ September 1984 b/

| | Total Placed | | | | Remaining in Program | | | | Left Program | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| State | USCC | LIRS | Other | Total | USCC | LIRS | Other | Total | Reunited | Emancipated or Independent Living or Other |
| Alabama | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Arizona | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| California | 0 | 0 | 594 | 594 | 0 | 0 | 475 | 475 | 47 | 72 |
| Colorado | 42 | 46 | 3 | 91 | 3 | 16 | 2 | 26 | 20 | 45 |
| Connecticut | 1 | 23 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 23 | 1 | 0 |
| District of Columbia | 33 | 49 | 0 | 82 | 13 | 32 | 0 | 45 | 14 | 23 |
| Florida | 0 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 4 | 8 |
| Guam | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Hawaii | 0 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 20 |
| Illinois | 455 | 9 | 17 | 481 | 308 | 9 | 14 | 331 | 88 | 62 |
| Indiana | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| Iowa | 122 | 272 | 10 | 404 | 67 | 132 | 6 | 205 | 26 | 173 |
| Kansas | 13 | 49 | 0 | 62 | 5 | 21 | 0 | 26 | 10 | 26 |
| Louisiana | 57 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 38 |
| Maine | 0 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Maryland | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 14 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 4 |
| Massachusetts | 24 | 78 | 0 | 102 | 24 | 71 | 0 | 95 | 2 | 4+1 died |
| Michigan | 60 | 86 | 89 | 235 | 36 | 49 | 55 | 140 | 75 | 20 |
| Minnesota | 134 | 446 | 21 | 601 | 70 | 243 | 16 | 329 | 73 | 199 |
| Mississippi | 54 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 4 | 7+1 suicide |
| Missouri | 10 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 3 |
| Montana | 0 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 21 | 5 | 19 |
| New Hampshire | 65 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 1 | 8 |
| New Jersey | 131 | 46 | 0 | 177 | 104 | 34 | 0 | 138 | 5 | 34 |
| New Mexico | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| New York | 780 | 203 | 0 | 983 | 592 | 179 | 0 | 771 | 81 | 131 |
| North Carolina | 2 | 46 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 34 | 2 | 12 |
| North Dakota | 0 | 38 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 33 | 1 | 4 |
| Ohio | 5 | 25 | 3 | 33 | 5 | 15 | 2 | 22 | 3 | 8 |
| Oklahoma | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Oregon | 257 | 160 | 21 | 438 | 117 | 70 | 15 | 202 | 88 | 148 |
| Pennsylvania | 17 | 277 | 0 | 294 | 10 | 129 | *3 | 142 | 62 | 90 |
| Rhode Island | 19 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 0 | 0 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 0 | *1+24 | 25 | 3 | 3 |
| Utah | 53 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 16 |
| Vermont | 23 | 33 | 0 | 56 | 19 | 33 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 4 |
| Virginia | 129 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 4 | 3 |
| Washington State | 251 | 105 | 0 | 356 | 109 | 47 | 0 | 156 | 48 | 152 |
| Wisconsin | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 4 | 31 |
| TOTAL | 2,774 | 2,036 | 923 | 5,733 | 1,818 | 1,190 | 676 | 3,684 | 679 | 1,370 |

---

a/ USCC = United States Catholic Conference.
LIRS = Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service.

b/ Reports received by ORR from the States as of September 1984.

* Children placed out of State.

## APPENDIX B

## FEDERAL AGENCY REPORTS

# BUREAU FOR REFUGEE PROGRAMS

## Department of State

### General

The Bureau for Refugee Programs is charged with both support for refugee relief overseas and admissions of refugees into the United States. U.S. policy is to contribute to international relief efforts for refugees in countries of first asylum and to encourage refugees, where possible, to return to their homelands once the situation which caused them to flee improves. When repatriation cannot take place, the Bureau supports resettlement in the country of first asylum or elsewhere in the region. Where none of these alternatives is possible, as generally has been the case in Southeast Asia, the United States accepts for admission refugees who are of particular concern to us. Over the past few years, the Bureau has increasingly focused on relief to refugees abroad as admissions have continued to decrease. Total admissions to the United States in FY 1984 were 71,113.

During the 1984 fiscal year, worldwide refugee problems continued to be serious, persistent, and widespread, and millions of people remained in uncertain and tenuous circumstances. During the year, thousands of new refugees fled foreign intervention, civil war, and persecution and crossed international borders in search of temporary or permanent refuge.

### U.S. Program Worldwide

During the course of the year, the United States supported international relief programs in a number of countries including Thailand, Pakistan, Lebanon, Sudan, Uganda, Somalia, Djibouti, and

Honduras. Emergency relief was provided for Palestinian refugees in the Near East. The relief program in Central America continued to expand. Of the $343 million expended by the Bureau for Refugee Programs in FY 1984, approximately $244.6 million went to relief programs and other non-admissions related costs.

Approximately $98.4 million was spent for activities related to the admission of refugees to the United States. These activities include processing and documentation (including agreements with the Joint Voluntary Agency Representatives in Southeast and South Asia, and individual voluntary agencies in Europe), overseas English language and cultural orientation training, transportation arranged through the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration, and the reception and placement grants to U.S. voluntary agencies to support initial resettlement activities. Of the total admissions program, $72.6 million was for Southeast Asian refugee admissions, while $25.8 million funded admissions of refugees from the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, Africa, the Near East, South Asia and Latin America.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## REFUGEE ARRIVALS IN THE UNITED STATES
## FY 1984

Department of State
Bureau for Refugee Programs

Report Date : October 23, 1984

| A R E A | OCT | NOV | DEC | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | TOTAL | CEILINGS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AFRICA | 5 | 77 | 78 | 124 | 121 | 359 | 404 | 273 | 310 | 255 | 435 | 306 | 2,747* | 2,750++ |
| EAST ASIA | 3,103 | 4,248 | 3,469 | 3,736 | 4,230 | 5,075 | 3,360 | 3,103 | 6,973 | 3,674 | 5,846 | 5,143 | 51,960 | 52,000++ |
| EASTERN EUROPE AND SOVIET UNION | 335 | 817 | 1,331 | 844 | 758 | 1,086 | 880 | 1,192 | 903 | 951 | 986 | 917 | 11,000 | 11,000++ |
| LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN | 13 | 74 | 30 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 160+ | 1,000 |
| NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA | 65 | 360 | 503 | 399 | 470 | 731 | 330 | 484 | 443 | 319 | 552 | 590 | 5,246** | 5,250++ |
| TOTAL | 3,521 | 5,576 | 5,411 | 5,106 | 5,580 | 7,255 | 4,992 | 5,052 | 8,629 | 5,205 | 7,819 | 6,967 | 71,113 | 72,000 |

| * AFRICA | SEP | YEAR TO DATE |
|---|---|---|
| Processed in Europe: | | |
| Ethiopians | 26 | 250 |
| Others | 0 | 3 |
| Processed in Africa: | | |
| Angolans | 5 | 81 |
| Basothos | 1 | 16 |
| Ethiopians | 259 | 2,283 |
| Malawians | 4 | 14 |
| Mozambicans | 0 | 26 |
| Namibians | 6 | 22 |
| South Africans | 4 | 14 |
| Ugandans | 0 | 2 |
| Zairians | 1 | 36 |
| | 306 | 2,747 |

| ** NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA | SEP | YEAR TO DATE |
|---|---|---|
| Processed in Europe: | | |
| Afghans | 2 | 278 |
| Iranians | 258 | 2,729 |
| Iraqis | 4 | 194 |
| Syrians | 0 | 6 |
| Processed in Africa: | | |
| Afghans | 0 | 1 |
| Iranians | 0 | 9 |
| Iraqis | 0 | 1 |
| Processed in South Asia: | | |
| Afghans | 313 | 1,849 |
| Iranians | 13 | 179 |
| T O T A L : | 590 | 5,246 |

| + LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN: | SEP | YEAR TO DATE |
|---|---|---|
| Processed in Europe: | | |
| Cubans | 11 | 40 |
| Processed in Latin America: | | |
| Cubans | 0 | 27 |
| Salvadorians | 0 | 93 |
| T O T A L : | 11 | 160 |

---

++ As adjusted for FY-1984, following consultations with the Congress in June.

# DETAILED REPORT OF
# REFUGEE ARRIVALS IN THE UNITED STATES
# FROM THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE
## FY 1984

Report Date : October 23, 1984

| AREA | OCT | NOV | DEC | JAN | FEB | MARCH | APRIL | MAY | JUNE | JULY | AUG | SEPT | TOTAL | CEILINGS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SOVIET UNION TCP | 7 | 8 | 13 | 16 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 9 | 4 | 104 | - |
| SOVIET UNION NON-TCP | 51 | 78 | 42 | 60 | 43 | 50 | 49 | 20 | 63 | 59 | 49 | 47 | 611 | - |
| SUB TOTAL SOVIET UNION | 58 | 86 | 55 | 76 | 49 | 55 | 61 | 24 | 70 | 72 | 58 | 51 | 715 | - |

| AREA | OCT | NOV | DEC | JAN | FEB | MARCH | APRIL | MAY | JUNE | JULY | AUG | SEPT | TOTAL | CEILINGS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ROMANIAN TCP | 0 | 0 | 482 | 141 | 87 | 257 | 199 | 380 | 244 | 285 | 365 | 47 | 2,487 | - |
| ROMANIAN NON-TCP | 59 | 153 | 211 | 196 | 201 | 218 | 180 | 174 | 139 | 88 | 90 | 175 | 1,884 | - |
| POLES | 125 | 425 | 370 | 309 | 283 | 430 | 307 | 468 | 338 | 406 | 383 | 487 | 4,331 | - |
| OTHER EAST EUR. | 93 | 153 | 213 | 122 | 138 | 126 | 133 | 146 | 112 | 100 | 90 | 157 | 1,583* | - |
| SUB TOTAL EASTERN EUROPE | 277 | 731 | 1,276 | 768 | 709 | 1,031 | 819 | 1,168 | 833 | 879 | 928 | 866 | 10,285 | - |
| **TOTAL** | 335 | 817 | 1,331 | 844 | 758 | 1,086 | 880 | 1,192 | 903 | 951 | 986 | 917 | 11,000 | 11,000 |

| (*) | SEP | YEAR TO DATE |
|---|---|---|
| Albanians | 4 | 46 |
| Bulgarians | 13 | 127 |
| Czechs | 94 | 853 |
| Hungarians | 46 | 549 |
| Yugoslavs | 0 | 8 |
| TOTAL : | 157 | 1,583 |

B-1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# S U M M A R Y

## REFUGEE ARRIVALS IN THE UNITED STATES

Report Date : October 23, 1984

| A R E A | FY-75 | FY-76 | FY-77 | FY-78 | FY-79 | FY-80 | FY-81 | FY-82 | FY-83 | YTD FY-84 | FY-85 | FY-86 | TOTAL | R E M A R K S |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AFRICA | - | - | - | - | - | 955 | 2,119 | 3,326 | 2,648 | 2,747 | | | 11,795 | |
| ASIA | 135,000 | 15,000 | 7,000 | 20,574 | 76,521 | 163,799 | 131,139 | 73,522 | 39,408 | 51,960 | | | 713,923 | |
| EASTERN EUROPE | 1,947 | 1,756 | 1,755 | 2,245 | 3,393 | 5,025 | 6,704 | 10,780 | 12,083 | 10,285 | | | 55,973 | |
| SOVIET UNION | 6,211 | 7,450 | 8,191 | 10,688 | 24,449 | 28,444 | 13,444 | 2,756 | 1,409 | 715 | | | 103,757 | |
| LATIN AMERICA | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 7,000 | 6,662 | 2,017 | 602 | 668 | 160 | | | 29,109 | |
| NEAR EAST | - | - | - | - | - | 2,231 | 3,829 | 6,369 | 5,465 | 5,246 | | | 23,140 | |
| TOTAL | 146,158 | 27,206 | 19,946 | 36,507 | 111,363 | 207,116 | 159,252 | 97,355 | 61,681 | 71,113 | | | 937,697 | |

**Sources:** ASIA: Reporting telegrams from SEA posts.
AFRICA, EUROPE, LATIN AMERICA & NEAR EAST: RMA Geneva.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

### Department of Justice

The Immigration and Naturalization Service's (INS) overseas offices have the responsibility for carrying out the INS refugee program. Those offices examine and process refugees, authorize waivers of grounds of excludability, adjudicate certain applications for permission to reapply for admission to the United States after deportation or removal, approve visa petitions of any immediate relative or preference status (except third and sixth preference) and investigate allegations of fraud in connection with applications and petitions filed in the United States.

The INS offices abroad maintain direct and continuous liaison with the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration (ICM), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) representatives, foreign government representatives, United States governmental agencies, and all voluntary agencies having offices abroad.

In FY 1983 and FY 1984, INS instituted a series of program improvements in its refugee processing and overseas operations. A significant development in refugee processing was the issuance of INS Worldwide Guidelines for Overseas Refugee Processing. Also instituted was the redistribution of workload among overseas offices; the addition of improved training and rotation policies for overseas personnel and the replacement of temporary detail personnel with fewer and less costly permanent staff; improvement in the conditions of service for overseas personnel; streamlining the Service's headquarters management support for overseas offices through greater reliance on the program management capacity of overseas offices; the greater use of routine administrative services provided by U.S. embassies and consulates abroad; and emphasis on substantive, programmatic reviews by Washington headquarters; the establishment of a formal headquarter review of denied refugee cases, and the relocation of the Hong Kong District Office to Bangkok to provide for improved direction and greater effectiveness and economy in the Service's operations in Asia.

## OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND MINORITY LANGUAGES AFFAIRS

### Department of Education

The Refugee Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-212) authorizes the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to provide services or make agreements with other agencies to provide services to refugees. Section 412(d)(1) of the Act addresses the educational needs of refugee children: "The Director is authorized to make grants, and enter into contracts, for payments for projects to provide special educational services (including English language training) to refugee children in elementary and secondary school where a demonstrated need has been shown."

The responsibility for providing an educational program for elementary and secondary refugee students rests with the Department of Education (ED) through an interagency agreement with ORR/HHS. This agreement provides the operating mechanism through which funds are made available for distribution under the Transition Program for Refugee Children.

During the school year 1984-1985, $16.6 million was made available to States to provide educational services to refugee children. These funds served 93,920 refugee children nationwide.

## TRANSITION PROGRAM FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN

### School Year 1984-1985

| State | Refugee Children | Amount of Award |
|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 318 | $ 61,570 |
| Alaska | | Not Eligible |
| Arizona | 590 | 114,560 |
| Arkansas | 228 | 36,720 |
| California | 29,601 | 5,096,420 |
| Colorado | 734 | 118,950 |
| Connecticut | 1,488 | 249,540 |
| Delaware | 94 | 19,790 |
| District of Columbia | 83 | 18,100 |
| Florida | 4,706 | 893,620 |
| Georgia | 826 | 156,370 |
| Hawaii | 431 | 56,560 |
| Idaho | 264 | 47,990 |
| Illinois | 4,101 | 742,600 |
| Indiana | 251 | 44,180 |
| Iowa | 1,139 | 195,320 |
| Kansas | 1,648 | 252,830 |
| Kentucky | 441 | 78,370 |
| Louisiana | 1,691 | 270,620 |
| Maine | 358 | 78,030 |
| Maryland | 1,173 | 204,630 |
| Massachusetts | 4,125 | 735,010 |
| Michigan | 1,517 | 268,990 |
| Minnesota | 2,252 | 398,720 |
| Mississippi | 272 | 44,730 |
| Missouri | 668 | 128,660 |
| Montana | 85 | 12,230 |
| Nebraska | 380 | 69,860 |
| Nevada | 286 | 60,000 |
| New Hampshire | 150 | 28,270 |
| New Jersey | 1,232 | 233,230 |
| New Mexico | | Did not apply |
| New York | 4,043 | 736,210 |
| North Carolina | 1,004 | 191,970 |
| North Dakota | 84 | 15,980 |
| Ohio | 1,473 | 226,350 |
| Oklahoma | 1,113 | 200,080 |
| Oregon | 1,857 | 324,220 |
| Pennsylvania | 3,710 | 683,830 |
| Rhode Island | 2,281 | 380,840 |
| South Carolina | 259 | 44,490 |
| South Dakota | 102 | 15,330 |

| State | Refugee Children | Amount of Award |
|---|---|---|
| Tennessee | 1,111 | 205,650 |
| Texas | 6,394 | 1,164,200 |
| Utah | 1,199 | 203,590 |
| Vermont | 77 | 18,500 |
| Virginia | 3,657 | 668,990 |
| Washington | 3,473 | 639,560 |
| West Virginia | | Did not apply |
| Wisconsin | 951 | 162,270 |
| Wyoming | | Did not apply |
| TOTAL | 93,920 | $16,598,530 |

## U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

### Department of Health and Human Services

As the Public Health Service (PHS) is charged with ensuring that aliens entering the United States do not pose a threat to the public health of the U.S. populace, its activities related to refugee health included the monitoring of the health screening of U.S.-bound refugees in Southeast Asia, the inspection of these refugees at U.S. ports-of-entry, the notification of the appropriate State and local health departments of those new arrivals requiring follow-up care and the provision of domestic health assessments.

The Office of Refugee Health (ORH) in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health continued to coordinate the activities of those PHS agencies involved with the refugee health program. In matters related to domestic health activities, ORH worked closely with the HHS office of Refugee Resettlement, where it maintained a liaison office. PHS also worked closely with the Bureau for Refugee Programs in the Department of State and with the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice on activities related to health screening and health conditions at the refugee camps overseas.

ORH undertook several special initiatives during FY 1984 including efforts to strengthen the monitoring of overseas screening for refugees arriving from Europe, the Near East, Africa and South Asia. In cooperation with the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) and the National Institute of Mental Health, ORH worked toward the development of a strategy for meeting the mental health needs of refugees resettled in the United States. The American Red Cross, under contract with ORH, instituted a cardiopulmonary resuscitation instructor training program for refugees from Southeast Asia, particularly Hmong, in an effort to increase the number of survivors experiencing the symptoms of Sudden Unexplained Nocturnal Death Syndrome. Extensive technical assistance and consultation was provided for the expansion of medical and dental services at the Philippine Refugee Processing Center in Bataan.

The PHS agency with major refugee activities in FY 1984 continued to be the Centers for Disease Control(CDC). The activities of the various PHS offices and agencies are discussed below.

## Centers for Disease Control

During FY 1984, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) continued its legislated responsibility of evaluating and sustaining the quality of the medical screening examinations provided to refugees seeking to resettle in the United States. The program included inspection of refugees and their medical records at U.S. ports-of-entry and the continuation of the health data collection and dissemination system. An immunization program, including vaccination against polio, diptheria, pertussis, tetanus, measles, mumps, and rubella, has been in operation in Southeast Asia for refugees coming to this country since January 1981. Over 99 percent of the refugees are currently being provided age-specific immunications against these diseases, and over 36,400 Indochinese refugees have been immunized to date.

CDC quarantine officers continued to provide prompt and accurate notification to State and local health departments of each refugee's arrival. Quarantine officers paid particular attention to refugees with active or suspected active (Class A) tuberculosis and notified the appropriate local health departments by telephone within 24 hours of the refugee's arrival in the United States. CDC also responded to requests for assistance from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to develop and implement effective public health measures to reduce the incidence of disease in the refugee camps in Southeast Asia.

CDC continued to station two public health advisors in Bangkok, Thailand, to operate a regional program to monitor and evaluate the medical screening examination provided to refugees in Southeast Asia. Initial steps were taken to station a public health advisor in Europe, to perform similar duties related to refugees coming to the United States from Europe, Africa, the Near East, and South Asia. During FY 1984, CDC quarantine officers at the U.S. ports-of-entry inspected all of the arriving refugees (approximately 52,000 from Southeast Asia and 18,500 from other areas of the world). As part of the stateside follow-up, CDC collected and disseminated copies of refugee health and immunization documentation to State and local health departments. Mini-computers and printers at U.S. ports-of-entry were used to compile refugee health data and to print more than 2,500 different State and local health department address labels. These lables were used to address refugee medical documentation packets to health departments and to instruct refugees to report to the appropriate health department.

A computerized disease surveillance data base on demographic and arrival data on refugees was continued in FY 1984 and expanded to include data on Indochinese completing tuberculosis chemotherapy before departure for the United States, those who receive tuberculin skin tests and are started on tuberculosis preventive therapy, those who are screened for hepatitis B surface antigenicity, and those who are placed on prophylaxis for Hansen's Disease. In addition, data was collected on refugees arriving from the Philippine Refugee Processing Center to assess the adequacy of special health initiatives being implemented in that facility.

The CDC data base on refugee arrivals was also used by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) as the primary source of arrival and destination statistics. CDC has computerized the medical screening and immunization records of the 435,000 Southeast Asian refugees entering this country since October 1979. Beginning in October 1982, medical screening results were also computerized for non-Indochinese refugees, and records on about 30,000 of these refugees are now in the CDC data base.

In FY 1984, a short course chemotherapy (SCC) regimen for tuberculosis was continued in Southeast Asia for U.S.-bound Indochinese refugees. During FY 1984, approximately 200 Indochinese completed SCC before arrival, resulting in less than one-half of one percent of Indochinese arriving with active tuberculosis, down from 2-4 percent of arrivals in previous years. In FY 1984, precedures were implemented to test Indochinese refugees for tuberculous infection and to implement isoniazid preventive therapy. The workload experienced by local health departments in the United States in providing tuberculosis treatment and followup services to Indochinese refugees decreased due to these disease control measures.

The overseas hepatitis B surface antigen screening program for pregnant females and unaccompanied minors was continued during FY 1984. Approximately 2,000 women and children were tested and about 15 percent have been identified as positive. CDC notified State and local health departments and refugee sponsors of those refugees with positive tests. Infants born to mothers identified as hepatitis B surface antigen carriers were given hepatitis B immune globulin at birth and every 3 months as long as they remained under ICM medical care in Southeast Asia. During the year, CDC hepatitis consultants made site visits to processing centers in Southeast Asia to implement screening improvements and administration of hepatitis B vaccine to newborns in Southeast Asia. In the United States, hepatitis B vaccine continued to be offered by health care providers to foster family members who were close household contacts of unaccompanied minors identified as being hepatitis B surface antigen carriers.

In FY 1984, CDC conducted a two-phased assessment of the health education needs of Indochinese refugees and of the instructional methodology used in overseas refugee processing centers in Thailand and the Philippines. Phase I of the health education project was conducted with a panel of 15 consultants who identified six refugee health problems which might be amenable to change by health education. Those health conditions were tuberculosis, intestinal problems, injuries due to "unfamiliar things," undernutrition, unwanted pregnancy, and dental caries. Phase II of the project was conducted in the refugee processing centers to identify the extent to which these six health problems were addressed through health education activities in the Refugee Processing

Centers. The results of the assessment will be presented to the Department of State so that modifications to health education methodology can be made in the processing centers.

CDC also continued surveillance on Sudden Unexplained Nocturnal Death Syndrome (SUNDS) among Indochinese refugees in the United States, and during FY 1984, CDC worked with State and local health departments to encourage the development of cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) training programs for Hmong refugees in targeted areas.

CDC continued to publish reports on refugee health problems in its Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR) as a means of rapidly providing useful information to health care providers in the United States. Since 1975, 87 articles concerning refugee health conditions have been published in the MMWR.

CDC continued to review the medical screening examinations given to refugees in Vietnam who were bound for the United States under the Orderly Departure Program.

## Domestic Health Assessments

Health assessment services again were provided to newly arrived refugees in FY 1984. The followup of Class A and Class B conditions identified through overseas screening continued to be a top priority for State and local health departments. Through a renewed interagency agreement with ORR, CDC again administered the Health Program for Refugees. The goals of the program remained: (1) to address unmet public health needs associated with refugees; and (2) to identify health problems which might impair effective resettlement, employability, and self-sufficiency and to refer such refugees for appropriate diagnosis and treatment. During FY 1984, increased emphasis was given to identifying refugees eligible for preventive treatment of tuberculous infection.

In FY 1984, grants were awarded to 41 States; the District of Columbia; the city of Philadelphia; Maricopa County, Arizona; Missoula County, Montana; and Barren River District Health Department, Kentucky. The nine States which did not participate in FY 1984 were Alaska, Arizona, Delware, Kentucky, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Awards were based on the number of newly arrived refugees, the relative burden created by secondary migration, plans for providing intensified tuberculosis preventive therapy and outreach services, program performance, and the justified need for grant support. The 10 most impacted States, which resettled 69.3 percent of all arriving refugees in FY 1984, received 65.8 percent of the $6.1 million in grant funds awarded.

During FY 1984, CDC assigned five Public Health Advisors to work in selected impacted areas to augment tuberculosis preventive therapy outreach activities. Public Health Advisors were selected to work in the following State and city health departments: Florida, Texas, California, Los Angeles, and New York City. In FY 1984, CDC personnel made 60 site visits to project areas and provided technical assistance, consultations, and program support to health assessment personnel there.

By the end of FY 1984, 76 percent of the grantees were voluntarily sharing usable data which again was used to assess the status of the national program. Approximately 84 percent of all refugees arriving in the 35 reporting areas received health assessments. Of the refugees who arrived in specific parts of these States in which grant funds had permitted the development of a coordinator program, 89.7 percent of the refugees were contacted, and 86 percent of them received health assessments. Among those refugees who received health assessments, 61.1 percent had one or more medical or dental health conditions identified that required treatment and/or referral for specialized diagnosis and care. Limited data and site review observations indicated that nearly 100 percent of refugee children seen received required immunizations against the vaccine-preventable childhood diseases.

The identification of secondary migrants continued to be a major problem in FY 1984. Grantee data showed that 31.9 percent of all health assessments performed in FY 1984 were for secondary migrants, as opposed to 31.7 percent in FY 1983.

CDC encouraged the development of refugee health registries to permit effective tracking and reporting on the health assessments of all new refugee arrivals in those project areas which had not yet implemented procedures to systematically identify secondary migrants. CDC continued to encourage all grantees to develop networks to identify out-migrating refugees and procedures for communicating with other States on the movement of refugees who were under care for various conditions, especially those of public health concern. Significant progress was made in that endeavor; and information flowed routinely as refugees out-migrated, instead of only in response to specific requests for receiving localities. Through computerized records on refugee arrivals, CDC provided project areas with information about secondary migrants whose initial resettlement areas were in question. This enabled the areas with those secondary migrants to identify promptly the probable location of prior health records, and to request test results and incomplete treatment records if needed.

## HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

### Hansen's Disease Activities

Refugees, who had been diagnosed in Southeast Asia as having Hansen's Disease, were referred to the Regional Hansen's Disease Center at Seton Memorial Hospital in Daly City, California. Patients and close family members were examined by the PHS leprologist at the Regional Center, which served as the base line information for referral to refugee sponsors and the physicians who would provide case management on a continuous basis.

The Regional Hansen's Disease Center in the San Francisco area is one of eleven sponsored by the Division of National Hansen's Disease Medical Programs, Bureau of Health Care Delivery and Assistance, to assure the delivery of high quality medical care and adequate diagnosis and followup of patients suspected of having Hansen's Disease. These Centers are located in metropolitan areas where there are high numbers of Hansen's Disease patients: Honolulu, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Phoenix, Brownsville, Miami, Chicago, Boston, and New York.

During fiscal year 1984, 24 refugees were admitted to the National Hansen's Disease Center in Carville, Louisiana, because of complications in their treatment. Lepromatous leprosy generally requires life-long medication to ensure that the patient remains non-infectious and does not develop deformities or blindness from the disease complications.

## Community Health Centers

The Community Health Center and Migrant Health Center programs in the Bureau of Health Care Delivery and Assistance do not collect or maintain specific data on health services provided to refugees. Many of the Centers do, however, provide primary health care services to refugees in their catchment areas. Some Centers employed translators and used bilingual signs and notices to assist in health care delivery. Some examples of program activities are detailed below:

- The Central Seattle Community Health Centers Consortium, a multi-clinic organization in Seattle, Washington, had several unique programs, including a translation service. The Indochinese Language Bank provided five full-time translators who spoke a total of 10 Indochinese languages and serviced Community Health Centers and other health care providers throughout the Seattle area. The consortium also utilized the skills of foreign-trained health professionals from Southeast Asian countries, some of whom were licensed physician assistants and particularly sensitive to the special needs of the refugee and low-income Asian populations.

- The Model Cities Health Center in St. Paul, Minnesota, provided primary health care services to approximately 300 Laotian refugees resettled in its service area.
- The Broadlawns Primary Care Center in Des Moines, Iowa, in addition to providing primary health care services to the Hmong community, offered nutrition and health education programs.

## ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

During fiscal year 1984, the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Adminstration, participated in several refugee activities.

NIMH, in conjunction with ORR and ORH, participated in an interagency workgroup to conceptualize and plan a service system improvement initiative for refugees in recognition of the critical need to prevent mental illness, promote mental health, and improve the existing system's capacity to adequately treat refugees with severe mental and emotional disability.

As a followup to a series of mental health regional workshops held in FY 1983, NIMH funded the development of a sourcebook entitled "Southeast Asian Mental Health: A Focus on Treatment, Training, Services, Prevention, Research, and the Federal Perspective." This sourcebook will synthesize the proceedings of the workshops and also include current knowledge in the mental health field.

Finally, an NIMH clinical psychologist served as a member of a United Nations High Commission on Refugee (UNHCR) assessment team which evaluated the mental health needs of boat refugees in Southeast Asian camps. The team's findings and detailed recommendations for each camp regarding the need for medical and social services will be shared by the UNHCR with countries participating in the refugee program.

## APPENDIX C

## RESETTLEMENT AGENCY REPORTS

(The following reports by the Voluntary and State Resettlement Agencies have been prepared by the individual agencies themselves and express judgments or opinions of the individual agency reporting.)

# AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR NATIONALITIES SERVICE (ACNS)

The American Council for Nationalities Service (ACNS) is a national non-sectarian organization which has been concerned with issues affecting immigrants, refugees, the foreign born and their descendents for sixty years. ACNS is the national office for a network of 33 member agencies and affiliates across the country. All members of the ACNS network provide services to refugees in their local communities. Twenty-eight are active in direct resettlement of refugees from overseas. In addition to initial resettlement, member agencies provide ongoing services including casework and counseling, legal immigration, educational services and a range of community awareness activities.

Since 1975, the ACNS network has directly assisted over 65,000 refugees from Southeast Asia, Eastern Europe, the Near East, Africa, Afghanistan, and Cuba to become productive members of American society. In addition to serving refugees directly resettled by ACNS, member agencies provide extensive social services, employment assistance, language training, and immigration services to large numbers of refugees sponsored by other agencies.

Resettlement Program

During fiscal year 1984 ACNS and its member agencies resettled the following numbers of refugees:

| | |
|---|---|
| Afghan | 271 |
| African | 462 |
| European | 159 |
| Hmong | 409 |
| Khmer | 2,768 |
| Laotian | 516 |
| Latin American | 14 |
| Vietnamese | 1,880 |
| | 6,479 |

The National Office of ACNS provides a variety of refugee-related resources to member agencies and affiliates. Program development and monitoring, centralized information development and distribution, aasistance with management allocations and processing of refugees are just a few of these services.

ACNS member agencies serve as sponsors for all refugees they resettle. Although relatives of interested groups may act as co-sponsors, member agencies are responsible for insuring that pre-arrival arrangements are completed and that the refugee or refugee family is met at the airport. In addition, agencies secure housing, provide furniture, food, clothing, and financial support for a minimum of 30 days. All refugees are referred for medical screening as soon as possible after arrival.

Utilizing a case management approach, ACNS assigns each refugee to a case manager. The case manager works with the refugee on an ongoing basis to assess needs and to develop and implement a resettlement plan. If the case manager does not speak the refugee's language, interpreter services, either from agency staff or volunteers, are available. Although supportive services, such as ESL and counseling may be required, the focus of all planning is on the acquisition of employment for all employable refugees as quickly as possible.

## Special Projects Focusing on Employment

ACNS' professional, community-based network has enabled it to engage in a variety of special projects designed to promote self-sufficiency. During fiscal year 1984, ACNS completed a 15-month Case Management Demonstration Project funded by the Office of Refugee Resettlement. Using three member agencies as demonstration sites, the project sought to field test case management by putting comparable systems in place in divergent communities. Client progress toward self-sufficiency was recorded with a common measurement tool, the ACNS Employment Development Plan (EDP). It is hoped that findings from this project will contribute to implementation of more effective case management systems and practices in the future.

ACNS is also involved in a special project to resettle "hard-to-place" Mariel Cubans from the Atlanta Federal Correctional Institution. The project fosters strong client-staff relationships by having all services provided by the sponsoring agency. In addition, a special demonstration component of the program involves agency provision of all financial support for each client for up to six months, thereby eliminating the need to access welfare. This approach has proven highly effective, and a large percentage of Cubans have found employment during this six-month period. There is a strong feeling that the basic elements of this program can be translated to other populations.

During fiscal year 1984 ACNS member agencies also participated in the Matching Grant Program in which Federal funds were matched by private contributions to provide employment and employment-related services to non-Indochinese refugees. With strong volunteer support and other private resources, the programs included job preparation and placement augmented by vocationally oriented ESL and acculturation counseling.

## Related Activities

ACNS sees its commitment to refugees and immigrants as broader than sponsorship and resettlement. The ACNS public information program is unique in the scope of its interests, target populations, and activities. Since 1923, ACNS has published the weekly newsletter Interpreter Releases, considered the preeminent publication in the field of immigration and nationality law. Since December 1981, ACNS has published Refugee Reports, a national bi-weekly resettlement newsletter.

Refugee Reports is widely distributed and meets the information needs of public officials, private agency personnel, and community groups serving refugees in the United States.

The United States Committee for Refugees (USCR), the public information program of ACNS, informs the American public, policy-makers and practitioners of refugee problems around the world and stresses the vested interest this country has in responding to and supporting principles regarding refugee well-being.

USCR publishes the World Refugee Survey, an annual compilation of articles and statistics on refugee problems, and also issues special reports on specific refugee problems with recommendations for their resolution. Recent issue papers include a report on piracy in the South China Sea, an analysis of the Ugandan refugee crisis and a report on Afghan refugees in Pakistan.

Volunteerism is an important aspect of the ACNS programs. Volunteers provide thousands of hours of service each year to member agencies. Among other contributions, volunteers are active on governing boards, teach English, provide group instruction, solicit and collect donated goods, organize and run cultural events, and participate in community relations programs.

As community-based organizations, all member agencies involved in the refugee program are active in local and State refugee networks, often providing the focus for cooperation and coordination. In many places agencies have developed joint service projects with other service providers and Mutual Assistance Associations in order to maximize resources and coordination.

# AMERICAN FUND FOR CZECHOSLOVAK REFUGEES, INC.

The American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc. (AFCR) was organized in May 1948 in New York City after the communist coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia with the support of the Soviet Union, when tens of thousands of Czechoslovaks, many of whom had survived Nazi concentration camps, fled and were granted asylum in Germany, Austria, Italy, France, and other Western European countries. With the understanding and support of the governments of the countries of first asylum, the allied occupation military commanders, UNRRA, International Refugee Organization, and later United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 12 AFCR offices were established in Western Europe. Cooperating groups were created in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and South America. These endeavors resulted in the integration of many thousands of individuals in Western Europe and in the resettlement of many more in the United States and other countries of the free world.

In 1973 the AFCR was asked to assist also in the resettlement of Indians expelled from Uganda by the Idi Amin dictatorship.

In 1975 the AFCR was present and active in Camp Pendleton, California, and in Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania, helping resettle the first waves of Indochinese refugees.

Since its founding, the AFCR has served over 120,000 refugees from Eastern Europe and 16,585 Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian refugees since the beginning of the U.S Indochinese refugee program in 1975.

In FY 1984 the following refugees were resettled:

| | |
|---|---|
| Vietnamese | 464 |
| Khmer | 691 |
| Lao | 249 |
| Czechoslovaks | 395 |
| Poles | 121 |
| Bulgarians | 9 |
| Romanians | 5 |
| TOTAL | 1,934 |

The AFCR national office is located at 1776 Broadway, Suite 2105, New York, New York 10019. The regional offices, which are direct extensions of the parent agency, are located in New York City, Boston, Salt Lake City, and San Francisco. Each regional office is organized in a standardized manner; it maintains a regional director and the appropriate number of supportive staff in order to ensure the fulfillment of the regional responsibilities and comprehensive delivery of quality core services.

Each regional office is multi-ethnic in scope. The Indochinese and East European programs have been established at all sites and will be fully functioning throughout FY 1985. The Indochinese program carries out the resettlement of the entire range of all Indochinese ethnic groups and the East European programs concentrate mainly on Czechoslovak, Polish, and other East European refugees.

In addition to regional offices, the AFCR maintains three small resettlement operations: Chicago, Illinois; Bowling Green, Kentucky; and Minneapolis, Minnesota. In Chicago, "Nghiasinh International, Inc.", approximately 50 volunteers are involved in resettlement of 50 to 100 exclusively Vietnamese refugees during any fiscal year. In Bowling Green, the "Western Kentucky Refugee Mutual Assistance, Inc.", in cooperation with various local churches and private sponsors, has assisted the AFCR in resettling predominantly Cambodian and Lao family reunification cases. The expected caseload in FY 1985 is about 30 refugees. In Minneapolis, the AFCR has an agreement with the YMCA of Metropolitan Minneapolis, Hiawatha Branch, to resettle approximately 100 Lao refugees per year.

One of the more significant developments in the activities of the AFCR was the agreement in February 1984 with the International Institute of Idaho, approved by the State of Idaho, to resettle a substantial number of East European refugees in that State. One hundred four refugees, mostly Czechoslovaks, have been resettled in Idaho in the second half of FY 1984. This operation will continue in FY 1985.

The AFCR generally restricts the resettlement of refugees to those localities in which it has established regional offices or affiliated operations. Therefore, in keeping with this policy, refugees are resettled in New York City and vicinity, Massachusetts, California, Utah, and on a limited basis in Illinois, Idaho, Kentucky, and Minnesota. Out of the total of 530 East European refugees, 107 who are properly assured by individual sponsors have been resettled in the following States: Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin. East European refugees are generally provided with excellent services by their sponsors who are requested to submit written commitments to support their refugees. Also ethnic Czechoslovak organizations serve in the orientation process and acclimatization of new arrivals. To our knowledge, only 4 refugees thus resettled received any kind of public assistance.

Besides the network in the United States, the AFCR maintains its European headquarters in Munich, Germany, with regional offices in Vienna, Austria; Paris, France; and Rome, Italy. With the exception of Rome, all European offices register and process East European refugees for admission to several Western countries, mainly the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. East European refugees, predominantly Czechoslovaks, are resettled in those countries with the help of local ethnic Czechoslovak organizations. During FY 1984 the AFCR European offices helped 103 refugees emigrate to Canada, 42 to Australia, and 9 to other Western countries. Approximately 518 refugees were assisted in the process of local integration in the European countries of first asylum.

The AFCR resettlement program primarily utilizes the casework model in the provision of resettlement services. The AFCR's regional offices have in the past and will in the future provide, as required in the Cooperative Agreement with the Department of State, the necessary pre-arrival, reception, counseling, and referral services to their refugee clients. AFCR considers itself to be the ultimate sponsor of its refugee regardless of any other sponsorship arrangement.

Self-sufficiency is stressed at the outset of the resettlement process. AFCR functions with the belief that placement of refugees in employment immediately, or as soon as possible after arrival, while simultaneously encouraging development of skills required for subsequent advancement, is the most positive approach to resettlement and the achievement of self-sufficiency for the refugee. AFCR emphasizes the importance of English language training essential to both development of skills, etc., as well as to achieve self-sufficiency as quickly as possible.

## BUDDHIST COUNCIL FOR REFUGEE RESCUE AND RESETTLEMENT

The Buddhist Council for Refugee Rescue and Resettlement is an organization of Buddhist congregations and Mutual Assistance Associations that have come together to assist refugees in their efforts to become integrated and productive members of American society. Among the Buddhist organizations which are affiliated with the Buddhist Council, the oldest and most active have been involved in various aspects of assisting refugees and immigrants for many years. The member organizations share the ethnic, cultural, and religious background of the vast majority of the Indochinese refugees resettling in the United States and often function as the social and cultural centers for ethnic clusters where the great majority of Asian immigrants dwell.

While the Buddhist Council has resettled a few non-Asian refugees, the major emphasis of its resettlement efforts is the Indochinese refugee. Since this group of refugees, which has dominated the United States refugee flow since 1975, has needs and characteristics somewhat different than those served through the traditional European-oriented program, the Buddhist Council has developed a unique approach to resettlement. A majority of the refugees resettled through the Buddhist Council are initially resettled at a residential training site for a four-month training program which includes intensive ESL, employment services including vocational training, acculturation, medical screening and treatment, and final placement and resettlement at a site where self-sufficiency is most likely to occur.

This program design makes it possible to deliver a wide range of initial services without overlapping, duplication, or the waste of repeated and various referrals. It also makes it possible to generate an individually-tailored and realistic resettlement plan, based on direct contact and consultation with the refugee, with optimum chances for success in self-sufficiency, thereby reducing the probability of secondary migration.

This initial training program (Indochinese Refugee Training Program) provides the Buddhist Council an opportunity to do the following:

1) Develop a clear profile of the refugee family in regards to their employment skills and close personal contacts, family or otherwise, in the United States and set up a final resettlement opportunity upon graduation from the IRTP that will be stable and offer the greatest possibilities for productive adjustment to the United States society.
2) Resolve all medical problems and treat those that require followup.
3) Provide employment training for employable adults. Presently this includes training by professional and certified staff in janitorial work, landscape and garden maintenance, greenhouse and nursery skills, restaurant and kitchen cooking and

maintenance. Employment that is realistically available for refugees at the entry level. The Buddhist Council is in the process of developing further areas of training both in specific job skills and secondary skills necessary for full employment such as driver training.

4) Provide intensive ESL for all refugees, up to six hours a day. This aspect of the program is particularly important in giving the refugee an opportunity to remove the serious language barrier that makes rapid advancement in the work world difficult.

5) Provide a full day of school for all school age children and day care for pre-school children. This not only educates the children in the traditional school curriculum but further prepares the students for future classroom settings. The child-care for the pre-school children has the benefit of allowing the mothers to attend educational and training classes.

6) Instill the traditional American values concerning work and civic responsibility.

7) Deliver services in a coordinated and intensive fashion that are easily evaluated as to their per-capita costs for the whole range of services necessary in the initial stages of resettlement.

The final resettlement after completion of the program involves a further three months of oversight. The refugee is sent on to the final resettlement site in accord with the plan developed at the IRTP with the cooperation of the staff at the final resettlement site. The refugee is housed, clothed, fed, etc. with the aid of Buddhist Council per-capita funds and sub-contracted staff or volunteer workers, depending on the mode of resettlement, and the employment plan developed at the IRTP is put into effect.

The Buddhist Council has developed subcontractors at certain sites where a majority of its cases are resettled; these include: Houston, Texas; Kansas City, Missouri; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; and Pomona, California. At other sites where fewer refugees are resettled the Buddhist Council maintains a congregational approach. Congregations at such sites as Dallas, Texas; La Crosse, Minnesota; and Providence, Rhode Island etc., sponsor one case at a time, and work with that case until self-sufficiency is achieved. Refugees resettled with congregations are usually family reunification cases. Congregations delegate the responsibility for coordinating their resettlement plan with that of the Indochinese Refugee Training program to an individual with a social service background or to a committee.

## CHURCH WORLD SERVICE

The Immigration and Refugee Program of Church World Service is a part of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., an ecumenical community of 31 Christian communions. In fiscal year 1984 Church World Service (CWS) resettled 6,096 refugees from around the world through its participating denominations.

In an effort to better assess the progress of refugees resettled through its denominations, Church World Service undertook a major study of its refugees in collaboration with Calculogic Corporation, a New York City firm. This study, entitled Making It on Their Own: From Refugee Sponsorship to Self-Sufficiency was published in December of 1983 after a very thorough study with the aid of a computer of 2,189 returned questionnaries. The most important findings included the following:

1. Over time, most refugees are finding jobs.
2. Refugee use of public assistance is significantly lower than is commonly believed.
3. Over time, most refugees are achieving self-sufficiency.
4. CWS sponsors and congregations have contributed an estimated $133 million in cash, goods and services, and time over the past three and a half years.

Our survey made what is essentially a very simple point: the current wave of refugees is recapitulating the experience of all other groups of newcomers to the United States. After a period of time to get acclimated to their new homeland, today's refugees like all other immigrants are "making it on their own."

The report touched a sympathetic chord and received very positive press coverage both around the United States and in other counties. Some of the coverage of our report included the front pages of the Washington Post and The International Herald Tribune, editorial coverage in The Wall Street Journal and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and coverage in USA Today, U.S. News and World Report, and many newspapers through wire service coverage.

Meanwhile, Church World Service continued its service to refugees. Church World Service assists the work of the Protestant church community around the nation through 1) national denominational leadership, 2) Ecumenical Refugee Resettlement and Sponsorship Services (ERRSS) offices connected to local ecumenical church councils, and 3) local congregations.

The national denominations find church sponsors, and provide counseling, financial assistance, and monitoring throughout the sponsorship. The national resettlement officers of these denominations form the Immigration and Refugee Program Committee which makes policy and oversees the total program.

Many of our sponsors are assisted by Ecumenical Refugee Resettlement and Sponsorship Services (ERRSS) projects, which are located in areas of major CWS resettlement activity. These projects help find sponsors, provide information and advocacy for refugees, and conduct a variety of post-arrival services such as English-as-a-Second Language training, job development, referral, and counseling services.

Church World Service has standardized its national case management system as well as the reporting on the delivery of core services. ERRSS projects are now official case managers for Church World Service refugees resettled in their vicinities.

Several innovative programs have been initiated within the last year on the local level. These include matching grants, Favorable Alternate Sites Project (FASP), and Ethiopian clusters.

Two matching grant programs were established in cooperation with local resources in Columbus, Ohio, and Houston, Texas. These programs provide a structure for systematically combining government and private resources towards the goal of early employment. The success of these two programs has led to the planning of a third such program in Seattle.

A Favorable Alternate Sites Project (FASP) is currently underway in Virginia through the assistance of the Virginia Council of Churches Refugee program, our local Ecumenical Refugee Resettlement and Sponsorship Services (ERRSS) project. In this specially developed project, refugees and services are clustered in less impacted areas with careful monitoring of their progress.

Cluster resettlement of Ethiopians has proceeded well in Atlanta, Dallas, Houston, and Los Angeles, In all these areas ecumenical church and ethnic resources are pooled for groups of primarily single refugees.

In addition to the work of the Immigration and Refugee Program here in the United States, other offices of Church World Service work with addressing refugee needs in camps overseas such as Afghans in Pakistan and helping colleague churches around the world work to address the root causes which force refugees to flee.

Church World Service looks forward to continuing its serivce to refugees in the future in the unique partnership of private and public services.

## HIAS

HIAS, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, is the refugee and migration agency of the organized Jewish community in the United States. While we have worked over the years not only with Jewish refugees, but also with almost every major refugee migration in this country, our structure and system are particularly suited to assist the migration and absorption of Jewish refugees.

Our philosophy of resettlement is an outgrowth of over one hundred years of experience in the field of refugee resettlement. In developing this philosophy, we have had the advantage of being able to work in close conjunction with an extensive network of professionalized Jewish community social service agencies across the country. This network not only provides us with expert and professionally derived information and feedback on the progress of refugee resettlement, it also gives us the opportunity to develop a philosophy of resettlement depending upon trained and professional execution of policies and practices.

In resettling both Jewish and non-Jewish clients HIAS uses the facilities provided by Jewish Federations and their direct-service agencies, such as Jewish Family Services, Jewish Vocational Services and Jewish Community Centers in almost every city across the country. In New York, we use the services of the New York Association for New Americans, funded through the United Jewish Appeal. In national resettlement efforts, we work closely with the Council of Jewish Federations, the coordinating and planning agency for Jewish Federations in the United States and Canada. In our resettlement programs, wherever possible, the refugee becomes the responsibility of the organized Jewish community and is serviced by a team of qualified, trained professionals who have as their major priority the successful resettlement of refugees.

This program emphasizing professionalized services does not, on the other hand, fail to utilize resources such as the refugee's stateside family and volunteers. However, wherever needed the stateside family is given guidance and direction by a professional in the field of refugee resettlement. In like fashion, the volunteers are organized and trained -- again, by a professional.

In a very small percentage of our cases, the stateside relative, himself often a newcomer to the United States, is capable of assuming the major financial responsibility for the resettlement of his incoming family. Even in those cases, however, wherever possible we feel that a professional agency must stand by to alleviate any breakdown in resettlement plans.

HIAS monitors the progress of resettlement programs in individual communities very carefully, and conducts frequent nationwide seminars on resettlement. Therefore, flexibility and diversification of programming from community to community is possible. Because clients are placed by our New York office in a community of resettlement not only on the basis of relative reunion, but also on the basis of work potential and job markets, individual communities frequently develop caseloads with specific job orientations. Consequently, the types of programs developed in individual communities vary quite sharply. The differences in programming involve not only the type and extent of English language training, but also must consider the income potential of clients, their ability to develop self-help groups, housing requirements, size of families, and many other issues.

Moreover, certain areas have readily available job placements, while other areas have high rates of unemployment, but must be utilized for resettlement because of the exigencies of relative reunion. Quite clearly, the period of maintenance and types of services offered in these varying areas differ. Because we meet with both policy makers and practitioners from across the country on a frequent and regular basis, we feel that independence and flexibility in programming is not only possible, but necessary and beneficial to the resettlement process.

The nature of the execution of our programs allows not only for diversification of programming from community to community, it also allows for an efficient utilization of experience and new information concerning refugee resettlement. Our local affiliates are capable of drawing upon not only the long-time experience of the central HIAS office, but also the professional experience of other communities and agencies in developing refugee programming. Moreover, a professional staff has the advantage of dedication, training, and disciplined concern for refugees.

Quite clearly, effective refugee resettlement requires a group of people trained in differing areas of expertise; people with abilities in vocational assessment and job finding, English language training, family counseling, legal issues, etc. All of these areas, however, must be coordinated and brought together into a coherent program. Unless there is a central policy-making body in each community, there is a very great danger that various groups or agencies providing different specialized services may actually find themselves working at cross purposes, considering each part of the program as an end in itself, instead of as part of a total resettlement program. Therefore, while a great deal of independence must be given to an individual community, a highly coordinated effort must be developed within the community itself.

The sources and techniques of funding of resettlement programs of course, radically affect the ability of the individual community to coordinate its efforts. In the case of the Soviet Jewish resettlement program, both Federal and private funding is primarily funneled through the Jewish Federation, which can act as a central coordinating force in the community. In the case of programs for Southeast Asian refugees, on the other hand, the funding sources and recipients in the individual communities are more diversified. Therefore our affiliates are urged by the central HIAS office to work in close cooperation with their community coordination committees. The central HIAS office understands its responsibility to facilitate such community coordination.

While we have stressed that there is flexibility and diversification from community to community in the types of services offered to the refugees, there are of course, certain general guidelines upon which we and all our affiliates agree, and general agreement on the basic attitude towards resettlement. Both our placement policies and resettlement programs in general are structured around two essential elements:

Reunion with relatives whenever advisable, and dignified and appropriate employment as soon as possible. These principles can be translated basically into the twin goals of emotional and financial integration and adjustment.

By emphasizing relative reunion and the earliest possible appropriate job placement, we try to build upon the refugee's sense of independence and avoid fostering reliance on private and public institutions. Relative reunion helps this situation by shifting lines of the interdependency from a client-agency or client-government relationship, to a family relationship, which is, of course, to the client's advantage.

In terms of earliest possible appropriate job placement, we find that the vast majority of refugees have been out of work for at least a year by the time they arrive in the United States. Changes in culture, economic system, and separation from everything they know as familiar can create in the refugee a feeling of insecurity. Therefore, we find that giving priority to job placement, even if the job found is below the level indicated by the client's qualifications, is important not only for financial but for therapeutic reasons. Once the client has become socially and economically productive, he can improve his English after work, and, thereby, vocational upgrading can be considered.

Since 1975, the total number of HIAS assisted refugee arrivals to the U.S is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| FY 1975 | 7,958 |
| FY 1976 | 7,322 |
| FY 1977 | 6,732 |
| FY 1978 | 10,647 |
| FY 1979 | 28,626 |
| FY 1980 | 29,533 |
| FY 1981 | 13,115 |
| FY 1982 | 3,650 |
| FY 1983 | 2,568 |
| FY 1984 | 2,407 |

In the following table, refugees resettled in the U.S. by HIAS during FY 1984 are listed by country or region of origin:

| | |
|---|---|
| USSR | 562 |
| Eastern Europe | 108 |
| Afghanistan | 36 |
| Ethiopia | 72 |
| Southeast Asia | 1,257 |
| Iran | 363 |
| El Salvador | 9 |

The Cubans listed in the above table were refugees processed in Costa Rica for admission to the U.S.

## IDAHO VOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT AGENCY

The Idaho Voluntary Resettlement Agency was developed at the recommendation of the Governor's Task Force on Refugee Resettlement 1979. After surveying sponsors and refugees who resettled in Idaho between 1975 and 1979 and after talking with other State Refugee Coordinators, the Governor's Task Force concluded that there was a need for the local presence of a voluntary agency to promote and support quality resettlement in Idaho. The Idaho Voluntary Resettlement Agency contracted with the U.S. Department of State in January 1980 to respond to this need. In February of 1983 the Idaho Voluntary Resettlement Agency, at the Governor's recommendation, became a private, non-profit organization and is now housed in the Idaho International Institute.

During fiscal year 1984, the Idaho International Institute sponsored 149 direct placements to Idaho.

Fiscal Year 1984

Number of Refugees Resettled in Idaho

| Ethnic Group | Number of Refugees |
|---|---|
| Indochinese | 146 |
| East European | 3 |
| Total | 149 |

Favorable sites for resettlement within Idaho are identified by the voluntary agencies representatives through community meetings and through data provided through the State Coordinator's Office. Factors considered when identifying favorable sites include: the local unemployment rate, the impact on and availability of public and private resources to provide support services, community attitude (measured by volunteer response, media coverage, elected officials' positions on resettlement, and incidents of racial tension), population ratio of refugee to non-refugee, welfare dependency rate of local refugees, secondary migration, and the existence of an ethnic group as a support base.

Representatives of the Idaho International Institute recruit, train, and provide support and coordination to the over 100 volunteers who annually assist in providing resettlement core services. Volunteers act as sponsors, host families, friend families or as aides in providing core services. Thus volunteers can participate in resettlement efforts to various degrees, depending on their resources, talents, and time commitment. Sponsorship may be a group, family, or individual effort. Sponsorship recruitment is aimed at non-traditional groups such as fraternal organizations, civic clubs, educational institutions and youth groups as well as the more traditional religious congregations.

Close cooperation and coordination between the Idaho International Institute and the Health and Welfare Department's Refugee Resettlement Program accrue to the enrichment of both and the enhancement of the shared goal of refugee self-sufficiency.

# INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE, INC.

In 1984, the International Rescue Committee began its second half-century of service to the cause of refugees. Since its inception in 1933, the IRC has been exclusively dedicated to assisting people in flight, victims of oppression. As in the 1930s, when the IRC's energies were focused on the victims of Nazi persecution, so today IRC is directly involved in every major refugee crisis.

The response of the IRC to refugee emergencies is a two-fold one. A major effort is made domestically to help in the resettlement of refugees who have been accepted for admission to the United States. The second major effort lies in the provision of direct assistance to meet urgent needs of refugees abroad in flight or in temporary asylum in a neighboring country.

The IRC carries out its domestic resettlement responsibilities from its New York headquarters and a network of 14 regional resettlement offices around the United States. IRC also maintains offices in Europe to assist refugees in applying for admission to the United States. In addition, the IRC is responsible for the functioning of the Joint Voluntary Agency office in Thailand which, under contract to the Department of State, carries out the interviewing, documenting and processing of Indochinese refugees in Thailand destined for the United States.

Overseas refugee assistance programs are of an emergency nature, in response to the most urgent and critical needs of each particular situation. Most often, these programs have an educational or a health thrust to them, with a particular stress on preventive medicine, public health, sanitation, and health education. At present, the IRC has medical and relief programs of this nature in Thailand, Pakistan, Sudan, Lebanon, Costa Rica, Honduras, and El Salvador.

## Goals and Mission

The IRC's overiding goal and mission is to assist, by whatever means are most effective, refugees in need. Such assistance can be of a direct and immediate nature, especially through those programs overseas in areas where refugees are in flight. It can as well be in assisting refugees towards permanent solutions, in particular resettlement in a third country. The objective conditions that pertain in countries of first asylum are critical in determining what the most appropriate response may be.

The goal of IRC's resettlement program is to bring about the integration of the refugee into the mainstream of American society as rapidly and effectively as possible. The tools to accomplish this end are basically the provision of adequate housing, furnishings and clothing, employment opportunities, access to educational services, language training, and counseling.

IRC continues to maintain that refugee resettlement is most successful when the refugee is enabled to achieve self-sufficiency through employment as quickly as possible. True self-reliance can only be achieved when the refugee is able to earn his or her own living through having a job. This is the only viable way that refugees can once again gain control over their lives and participate to the best of their ability in their new society.

## IRC Resettlement Activities

The IRC domestic refugee resettlement activities are carried out through a network of 14 regional offices. They are staffed by professional case workers, and supported by volunteers from the local community.

The number of refugees and the ethnic groups each office resettles are determined by an on-going consultation process between each office and national headquarters. A yearly meeting of all resettlement office directors is held at New York headquarters usually at the beginning of each fiscal year. Daily contact, however, is maintained between offices and accommodations made in numbers and ethnic groups, based on new or unexpected refugee developments.

Caseworkers are expected to provide direct financial assistance to refugees on the basis of the specific needs of each case, within overall financial guidelines established by headquarters. The entire amount of the Reception and Placement grant plus privately raised funds are available to the regional office for its caseload.

The IRC acts as the primary sponsor for each refugee it resettles. As such, it assumes responsibility for pre-arrival services, reception at the airport, provision of housing, household furnishings, food and clothing, as well as direct financial help. Each refugee, as necessary, is provided with health screening, orientation to the community, and job counseling. In this connection, IRC provides for appropriate translation services, transportation, uniforms and tools for specific jobs and, where necessary, medical costs.

Newly arriving refugees are counselled on the desirability of early employment. Each office has job placement workers on staff and has developed contacts through the years with local employers. Federal or State funded job placement programs are utilized on a regular basis as well. IRC continues to be the fiscal agent for such federally-funded programs in New York and San Diego.

Each IRC regional office participates in local refugee forums, as well as advisory committees. Coordination is maintained also with the other resettlemnet agencies, the National Governors' Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, The National Association of Counties, and other refugee-related groups.

In addition to its New York headquarters, the IRC regional resettlement offices are located in Boston, Massachusetts; Washington, D.C.; Atlanta, Georgia; Houston and Dallas, Texas; San Diego, Orange County, Los Angeles, San Francisco and San Jose in California; and Seattle, Washington. Offices primarily assisting Cuban refugees are maintained in Union City, New Jersey; and Miami, Florida. The average number of permanent staff in each resettlement office is five to six.

During FY 1984, the International Rescue Committee resettled the following number of refugees:

| | |
|---|---|
| Vietnamese | 2,455 |
| Cambodians | 2,204 |
| Laotians | 980 |
| Romanians | 438 |
| Poles | 411 |
| Czechoslovaks | 82 |
| Soviets | 56 |
| Other Eastern Europeans | 120 |
| Iranians | 684 |
| Afghans | 207 |
| Ethiopians | 311 |
| Cubans | 31 |
| Total: | 7,979 |

## IOWA REFUGEE SERVICE CENTER

The State of Iowa's participation in the U.S. refugee program began in 1975 when Former Iowa Governor Robert D. Ray created the Governor's Task Force for Indochinese Resettlement. Although the name was later changed to Iowa Refugee Service Center (IRSC), Iowa's program has continued to concentrate on the resettlement of Southeast Asians. Iowa Governor Terry E. Branstad has upheld the strong support of the refugee program and under his leadership IRSC's employment-oriented approach to refugee service has been further strengthened.

### 8,700 Refugees in Iowa

IRSC has resettled about half of the 8,700 refugees living in Iowa. The other refugees have been resettled by a combination of other resettlement agencies represented in the State.

### Organization

IRSC is a resettlement agency for refugees, serves as the "single State agency" for U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) funds and is the major refugee service provider in Iowa. During FY 1984, Iowa Governor Branstad appointed Marvin Weidner as the Executive Director of IRSC. Weidner also serves as Iowa's Refugee State Coordinator.

### Employment-Oriented Services

IRSC operates an employment-oriented refugee program. IRSC utilizes a sophisticated case management system that emphasizes job development. In FY 1984, IRSC made a total of 881 job placements for refugees, for an average of 73 placements per month.

## Welfare Usage Low

Iowa has, throughout the years, maintained a very low welfare usage rate among its refugees. In September 1984, only 9.0 percent of the 8,700 refugees in Iowa were receiving cash or medical assisstance. (Iowa does not have a general assistance program.) Of the 9.0 percent figure, 210 people or 2.4 percent were unaccompanied refugee minors, 227 people or 2.6 percent were on Refugee Cash Assistance, 269 people or 3.1 percent were on Aid to Families with Dependent Children and 78 people or .9 percent were on various medical programs.

### IRSC Fiscal Year 1984 Ethnic Resettlement Totals

| | |
|---|---|
| Afghan | 3 |
| Cambodian | 75 |
| Hmong | 5 |
| Lao | 96 |
| Tai Dam | 24 |
| Vietnamese | 64 |
| Total for FY 1984 | 267 |

### IRSC Resettlement Total by Fiscal Year

| | |
|---|---|
| FY 1975-77 | 1,211 |
| FY 1978 | 166 |
| FY 1979 | 535 |
| FY 1980 | 1,399 |
| FY 1981 | 581 |
| FY 1982 | 155 |
| FY 1983 | 42 |
| FY 1984 | 267 |
| Total Resettlement | 4,356 |

## LUTHERAN IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE SERVICE

Lutheran people have been active since the 18th century in helping refugees and immigrants adjust to life in the United States; and the work of Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service today carries on that tradition. LIRS views resettlement as a strong moral commitment to systematically encourage refugee self-sufficiency and provide valuable contacts for employment. Since 1975, the Lutheran network has effectively resettled more than 80,000 refugees.

LIRS, a department of the Division of Mission and Ministry of the Lutheran Council in the USA, works on behalf of five church bodies representing 95% of all Lutherans in the United States. Its strength lies in congregational and group sponsorships that provide both material and emotional support to the newcomers. Self-sufficient refugee relatives and cooperating agencies are also accepted as sponsors when congregational or group sponsors are not available.

Each LIRS case is monitored and traced through a standardized system designed to meet individual refugee needs, emphasize early refugee employment, coordinate with community resources, and prevent duplication of services. The system not only ensures that refugees receive the 90-day services mandated by the U.S. Department of State--and that services are documented as required--but also stands ready to serve active cases for up to 12 months after arrival.

The Lutheran system is a three-tiered partnership of local sponsors, regional staff support, and national administration. In general, local sponsors are the primary "case managers" who arrange for initial housing, food, clothing, job placement, health care, enrollment of minors into school, and orientation to American life. These services are most heavily concentrated during the first six months after arrival. Goals are developed early on between the sponsor and the refugee toward long term self-sufficiency.

Regional offices, usually related to Lutheran social service agencies, provide back-up support. They are responsible for recruiting and training local sponsors and then for ensuring and documenting that all core services are provided. These regional offices also provide a variety of support services to local sponsors, and take part in consultations with local and State government officials for planning and coordination. The offices currently number 25.

The national office in New York City supports and monitors regional and local case management. This includes monitoring regional offices through annual on-site visits and quarterly reports; ensuring appropriate local sponsorship; coordinating reception services at ports of entry and final destination; seeing that tracking and monitoring requirements are met; providing technical assistance in such areas as job development, ESL training and administration of volunteer networks; collecting travel loans; providing situation-specific grants or loans to refugees;

coordinating resettlement of unaccompanied minors; arranging private medical insurance for non-Indochinese refugees who want it; acting as liaison with Interaction, the Refugee Data Center, and the Refugee Resource Center; consulting with government agencies; and, in general, helping local sponsors extend resources as far as possible.

The rapid placement of 74 Ethiopian cases in March 1984, even with relatively short lead time before their arrival, is just one example of how the three-tiered system works together. And for the fiscal year overall, LIRS successfully placed all of its cases approved for travel to the U.S. before the Department of State deadline. LIRS's mobilization has resulted in the effective placement of 5,566 refugees this fiscal year.

The highest concentrations of LIRS-resettled refugees are in Florida, Minnesota, Eastern Pennsylvania, Southern California, and New England. The largest percentages of those sponsored by congregations are in Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Arizona, and North Dakota.

It is LIRS policy to place refugees where there are existing refugee support groups. However, open cases or those involving distant relatives are not placed in areas already heavily impacted with refugee populations such as in Southern California. (Open cases are those which have no family or other contacts in the United States.)

It is also presumed that refugees do not need special services beyond those reasonably involved in resettlement such as language and job training. As a matter of policy, the agency believes that public assistance should only be used by refugees in emergency or unusual situations, or as a temporary means of support until the newcomer learns a marketable trade or skill.

The agency has successfully managed Favorable Alternate Site Placement (FASP) programs in Phoenix, Arizona and in Greensboro, North Carolina, to limit secondary migration and foster early employment. The Phoenix program placed 41 Vietnamese refugees into church sponsorships with no reliance on public assistance. The Greensboro program resulted in 95% of employable heads of households being employed. In addition, many family units have second, third, and even fourth employable persons in jobs.

This year for the first time, LIRS also participated in the Office of Refugee Resettlement's matching grant program, in which ORR will match on a dollar-for-dollar basis the cash and in-kind contributions made to each refugee. LIRS regional offices in South Dakota, Central Pennsylvania, and Florida are active in this program.

In cooperation with 20 State agencies, LIRS continues to place unaccompanied minors from Southeast Asia into foster homes. In addition, the agency will serve as primary coordinator and fiscal manager for two national conferences: the ACVA/PAID conference on Asian-American children and the ORR/LIRS/USCC conference on unaccompanied minors, both of which will be held during the next fiscal year.

Efforts were also made to strengthen the bond between resettlement work and Lutheran church bodies at the annual national conference of regional consultants. Panelists included the North American mission executives of four Lutheran church bodies, addressing resettlement and immigration concerns within the life and mission of the church.

LIRS continues its participation at international conferences as well, for example at the European Refugee Conference convened by the Department of State in Geneva, Switzerland, in November 1983.

The attached table shows refugees sponsored through LIRS by month and nationality for the fiscal year.

C-38

## LUTHERAN IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE SERVICE

## ARRIVALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984 BY MONTH AND NATIONALITY

| MONTH | 1. VIET | 2. CAMB | 3. LAO | 4. EUROPEAN | 5. AFRICAN | 6. NEAR EAST | 7. LATIN | 8. TOTAL ARRIVALS | 9. TOTAL IMMIGRANT ARRIVALS | 10. TOTAL REFUGEE ARRIVALS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OCT 83 | 96 | 108 | 44 | 22 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 273 | 9 | 264 |
| NOV 83 | 171 | 133 | 67 | 85 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 473 | 34 | 439 |
| DEC 83 | 170 | 80 | 33 | 100 | 9 | 12 | 12 | 416 | 24 | 392 |
| JAN 84 | 184 | 93 | 30 | 54 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 383 | 27 | 356 |
| FEB 84 | 141 | 111 | 59 | 86 | 10 | 22 | 0 | 429 | 10 | 419 |
| MAR 84 | 230 | 147 | 47 | 69 | 16 | 31 | 0 | 540 | 31 | 509 |
| APR 84 | 226 | 84 | 10 | 98 | 30 | 6 | 0 | 454 | 54 | 400 |
| MAY 84 | 186 | 91 | 36 | 122 | 49 | 19 | 0 | 503 | 32 | 471 |
| JUN 84 | 198 | 288 | 99 | 68 | 24 | 32 | 0 | 709 | 30 | 679 |
| JUL 84 | 142 | 154 | 19 | 73 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 411 | 37 | 374 |
| AUG 84 | 333 | 215 | 52 | 55 | 44 | 15 | 0 | 714 | 54 | 660 |
| SEP 84 | 231 | 159 | 115 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 0 | 616 | 13 | 603 |
| TOTAL: | 2,308 | 1,663 | 611 | 869 | 257 | 195 | 18 | 5,921 | 355 | 5,566 |

# POLISH AMERICAN IMMIGRATION AND RELIEF COMMITTEE, INC.

The Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee, Inc. (PAIRC) was founded after World War II, in the fall of 1946, to care for the expected masses of refugees to arrive from Poland, Germany, and other parts of the world. The United States Refugee Program began in 1958 its contractual relationship with the Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee for independent operations both in the United States and in Europe.

The Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee is the only international Polish American Immigration service in the free world. Through its United States offices and its branch offices in Munich, Paris, Rome, Vienna, and Brussels, the Committee has aided more than 36,092 refugees, mainly Poles, but in many cases also other East European nationals.

The Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee, Inc., is an organization dedicated to assisting refugees seeking a new life in the free world, particularly in the U.S., but also advises on emigration problems to other countries.

The paramount aim of PAIRC is the integration of refugees into American life and their speedy resettlement, so that the newcomers may become self-sufficient and productive members of their adopted country and not a drain on its economy.

The most effective way to reach this objective is to assist refugees in finding employment and living quarters, to direct them to the most convenient English language centers, and to provide individual counseling regarding their initial problems in the integration process, so that they may function effectively, and upgrade their skills, status, and education according to individual and local needs. When emergencies arise, the Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee assists the refugees financially as well.

After settling the refugees, PAIRC continues to provide information and counseling and to followup on each case in order to help them become independent citizens in the shortest possible time.

Individual files are kept on all recent and past arrivals as to their address and place of work. Many keep in touch and seek additional information and special assistance on their way to becoming American citizens.

PAIRC does not seek prospective immigrants still living in their native country. The Committee assists those refugees who have registered with one of the local PAIRC European offices.

The processing of the prospective refugees begins in Europe and is handled by PAIRC's European representatives who aid them in presenting their cases and preparing the necessary applications and documents for the U.S. authorities. As soon as the refugees are processed for the U.S., the New York PAIRC headquarters prepares for their arrival. PAIRC abandoned a practice of resettling refugees in cooperation with co-sponsors unless they are a refugee's relatives or close friends with well-established residency. This kind of relationship contributes to an early adaptation of newcomers to the American way of life. PAIRC acts as liaison between the refugee and co-sponsors, advising and guiding them as to what is required. PAIRC staff's experience in dealing with refugees who arrive from Poland and its knowledge of both Polish American affairs and the situation and problems existing in Poland constitute a unique asset in handling each case according to its individual needs. At the same time, the prospective immigrant is advised as to what to expect in the U.S. regarding living conditions and jobs and how to make resettlement as painless as possible.

Upon arrival in the U.S.A., the refugee is met at the port of entry, transported to the first lodging facility provided with initial financial assistance, helped in applying for a Social Security card and in finding living quarters and employment. If the immigrant's co-sponsor lives outside of New York City, PAIRC arranges for transportation to the refugee's final destination.

PAIRC stresses the individual approach in handling of each case, providing help, advice, and information. The office serves as a combination labor exchange, real-estate office, and, most important, an advisory and counseling office for the new arrivals. From the first days outside of Poland until the refugees resettle in the U.S.A., they are helped and directed.

The Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee, is a member of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service and cooperates with State and local government agencies. Although it has expertise in handling specific needs of Polish refugees and can give more attention and understanding to these new immigrants, PAIRC always had realized the advantages of working with other organizations well experienced in handling social problems.

Because of its contacts with local public and private manpower and employment agencies, as well as Polish-American organizations and media such as the Polish American Congress, veterans' organizations, Medicus, Polonia Technica, and Polish Parishes, PAIRC is able even better to help the newly arrived Polish refugees.

In fiscal year 1984 PAIRC resettled 591 Polish refugees and one Bulgarian. Thanks to a favorable economic climate about 92% of the refugees resettled by PAIRC were placed in jobs. The domestic resettlement program has improved and PAIRC did not encounter any substantial problems, though medical aid, in some States, is still tied to public assistance. The problem we encountered concerns delays in issuance of Social Security cards, mispelled names, and long waits for replacements. In some States business firms will not employ people on the strength of Social Security receipts, and a delay of a few weeks in receiving a Social Security card translates into additional resettlement cost.

In fiscal year 1985 PAIRC expects to resettle 600 refugees, out of which a considerable number will consist of families with infants and small children. These families will need help from additional programs.

# PRESIDING BISHOP'S FUND FOR WORLD RELIEF

## I. MISSION OF THE PFBWR/EC*

The specific mission and work of the PBFWR/EC is to respond to the Christian imperative as outlined in the 25th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, "to minister to the hungry and thirsty, the sick and those in prison, to clothe the naked and welcome the stranger." This response is seen as integral to the overall mission of the Episcopal Church which addresses the totality of human needs, both the spiritual as well as the physical.

The Fund's work is accomplished through its fourfold response in the areas of emergency/disaster relief, rehabilitation, development and refugee/migration assistance, both in the United States and overseas. The Fund's assistance to refugees incorporates aspects of all other areas of the PBFWR/EC ministry. In the past year this refugee ministry has been supported through some $350,000 of Church monies contributed to the Fund as well as many thousands of private dollars given regionally and locally, to provide assistance for refugees resettled in the U.S. through The Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief. In addition to the commitment of private financial resources, the Fund's refugee work is greatly enhanced by "in-kind" donations by members of sponsoring Episcopal Church parishes and friends.

---

*The full legal name of the Fund is: The Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief, of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

## II. GOALS OF THE PBFWR/EC IN GLOBAL REFUGEE RESPONSE INCLUDING U.S. RESETTLEMENT AS SPECIFIED BY THE REFUGEE AND MIGRATION COMMITTEE AND THE PBFWR/EC BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The goals of the PBFWR/EC refugee ministry during FY 1984 were:

A) Fulfilling of the imperative of this ministry by encouraging the active participation of the Church-at-large in resettlement services and follow-up care of refugees through:

1. Networks for information gathering and dissemination.
2. Communication of both Government and Church policy to encourage appropriate response.
3. Training for Church and Community volunteers.

B) Continued strengthening of existing international ecumenical response to refugees especially within the Anglican Communion, (a worldwide network of 29 Anglican Provinces of which the Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. is one), including assistance to refugees in areas of asylum.

C) Continued careful monitoring of the work and responsibilities of assigned staff; recommendations for the allocation of funds for the refugee ministry which include the expenditure of U.S. Government derived funds and fulfillment of Cooperative Agreement obligations.

D) The monitoring of Government actions and legislation relating to migration matters and sharing PBFWR/EC concerns with the various Governmental units and the Church-related constituencies.

E) The resettlement of approximately 1,700 refugees through U.S. Dioceses and congregations.

The PBFWR/EC believes that the goal of placement and resettlement of refugees is to enable refugees to preserve and develop cultural, family and individual strengths while becoming employed early on in the resettlement process. Refugees should be encouraged to become self-supporting, independent, and contributing members of the American community as soon as possible after arrival.

## III. PBFWR/EC POLICY AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Policy and practices as well as national operations are overseen by the PBFWR/EC Board of Directors, and especially its Refugee/Migration Committee. The Fund's program is directed from the Episcopal Church Center in New York City. In addition to the Executive Director, who reports to the Executive for World Mission and the Assistant Director for Migration Affairs, the New York office has four executive staff officers and one legal consultant in the Refugee/Migration section. There are three regional field offices with officers located in Los Angeles, California; Fort Worth, Texas; and New York, New York.

On the local diocesan and parish level, services for anchor relatives, parish sponsors as well as refugees are coordinated by the Diocesan Refugee Coordinators (DRC). DRCs are appointed by the Diocesan Bishop (who has the Canonical and legal jurisdiction for the Church in the region) throughout the 98 dioceses of the U.S. and Puerto Rico.

The Fund always uses the Diocesan structure of the Episcopal Church in refugee programming, enabling the work of the diocese. The fund allocates to each diocese $250 of the per capita Reception and Placement (R&P) Grant it receives from the Bureau for Refugee Programs of the

Department of State, regardless of the grant level. The Fund augments this allocation with $100 per capita of church monies for "impact aid" in designated locations for up to 1,000 refugees, as well as with emergency grants upon the diocesan Bishop's request.

Regular grants upon submission of a proposal, signed by the Bishop, and approved by the PBFWR/EC Board of Directors through its granting process are also available to support diocesan programs. These grants are almost entirely from Church dollars and help to provide sponsorship development, language and job training as well as other important requisites for successful resettlement.

## IV. SPECIFIC RESETTLEMENT ACTIVITIES DURING FY 1984

A major thrust of the FY 1984 activities has been the training of Diocesan Refugee Coordinators to better equip them to assist refugees and sponsors meet the stated goals of resettlement. This training emphasized achieving early employment, providing English language training and fulfilling the "core services" as outlined in the Fund's Cooperative Agreement with BRP/DOS.

A "resource manual" was assembled by the Fund's staff to assist DRCs with the provision of services to refugees received, placed and resettled through the PBFWR/EC. The manual contains information on the role of the DRCs as well as an overview of services available to refugees and sponsors. In addition, the manual provides:

(1) information on financial reporting;

(2) program monitoring procedures;

(3) social services;

(4) communication resources;

(5) educational opportunities; and

(6) language and cultural orientation materials.

Early employment of refugees continues to be an essential aspect of the Fund's resettlement program goals and activities. There are a variety of job counselling and placement programs supported by the participating dioceses and the Fund. Most counselling and placement assistance is provided by the parish sponsor, the DRC or diocesan staff.

During FY 1984 several dioceses initiated or greatly enhanced existing employment serivces to which the Fund has contributed:

A) Diocese of Connecticut - A small manufacturing concern is being developed which not only will employ refugees but also, provide training and the possibility of advancement into the wider manufacturing arena.

B) Diocese of West Tennessee - A special diocesan-wide task force on employment was established to help facilitate job development and placement.

C) Diocese of the Rio Grande - (New Mexico and the Trans-Pecos Area of Texas) - This diocese has been very successful with the development of pre-arrival job opportunities based on skills listed on the bio-data. For example, a computer programmer was sent to Las Cruces, New Mexico where there were several jobs available in his area of expertise. Another refugee with construction skills was resettled in Ruidoso, New Mexico, a growing community in need of people with building and construction skills.

D) Diocese of San Joaquin (California) - A program has been developed to assist the Hmong-Lao community with job skills and the development of agricultural marketing cooperatives.

E) Diocese of Olympia - An existing job development program was able to continue as a result of a grant from the Fund for the hiring of two job developers to assist refugees in the Tacoma and Seattle areas.

Innovative programs in sponsorship development and social service followup have also been developed on the diocesan level. The Diocese of Minnesota developed a plan calling for each region of the diocese to sponsor at least one refugee family within the next three years.

The Diocese of West Tennessee realized it had the potential to successfully resettle Polish refugees and has begun to concentrate efforts in this direction. Also, the Diocese of Connecticut has begun to utilize its resources collegially with other churches to serve more Cambodian refugees. The Diocese of Virginia has developed a program to deal specifically with the problems of secondary migration.

## V. Resettlement Statistics

Both the refugee arrivals and sponsorship assurances through The Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief have been increasing. This is due, in part, to increased filing of "interest" requests by sponsors and heightened activity by the DRCs, especially in promoting parish sponsorship.

Specific informaton on the numbers of refugees resettled via the PBFWR/EC and their country of origin is contained in the attached statistical report, "Fiscal Year 1984 Arrival Summary".

## Fiscal Year 1984 Arrival Summary

| Nationality | Cases | Individuals |
|---|---|---|
| **African** | | |
| Ethiopian | 37 | 73 |
| South African | 1 | 1 |
| Zairan | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 39 | 75 |
| **European** | | |
| Bulgarian | 2 | 2 |
| Czech | 8 | 17 |
| Hungarian | 6 | 11 |
| Polish | 52 | 101 |
| Romanian | 125 | 309 |
| TOTAL | 193 | 440 |
| **Indochinese** | | |
| Khmer | 107 | 543 |
| Loatian | 19 | 69 |
| Vietnamese | 134 | 255 |
| TOTAL | 260 | 867 |
| **Near East** | | |
| Afghan | 10 | 20 |
| Iranian | 110 | 173 |
| Iraqi | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 121 | 194 |
| Soviet | 4 | 4 |
| TOTAL | 4 | 4 |
| **Latin American** | | |
| Cuban | 1 | 8 |
| El Salvador | 4 | 9 |
| TOTAL | 5 | 17 |
| Total Arrivals for Fiscal Year 1984 | 622 | 1,597 |

## TOLSTOY FOUNDATION, INC.

The Tolstoy Foundation is a non-profit, non-political and non-sectarian international agency which counsels and provides services to refugees from all over the world. Since its founding in 1939 by Alexandra Tolstoy, youngest daughter of the renowned author and humanitarian, Leo Tolstoy, the Foundation has assisted Afghans, Armenians, Bulgarians, Cambodians, Circassians, Czechs, Ethiopians, Hungarians, Iranians, Iraqis, Laotians, Poles, Russians, Rumanians, Tibetans and Ugandan Asians, among others. Between 1948 and 1983 the Foundation provided assistance to over 50,000 refugees and immigrants. This number does not include the many refugees who were assisted in their resettlement in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South America. The Foundation has a European Headquarters in Munich, West Germany, as well as offices in five other European countries which arrange for the resettlement of refugees or provide aid and integration services for elderly and needy exiles.

The basic approach to any Tolstoy Foundation sponsored activity is governed by an awareness that assistance should recognize human dignity and work to build a sense of self-reliance as opposed to charitable support, so that refugees can be an asset to their new environments, contributing culturally and economically to the communities in which they live.

The Foundation currently participates in the resettlement of Southeast Asian, Soviet, Near Eastern, African, and East European refugees. Resettlement services are provided through regional offices, which work with local individual and group sponsors as well as private and public agencies involved in assisting refugees.

Services provided start prior to the arrival of the refugee in the United States, beginning with a search for private sponsors or relatives and their orientation. They continue with the verification of medical records and reception of the refugee at point of entry and final destination in the United States. Initial support is provided for food and clothing, housing, and basic household goods and furnishings, depending on individual needs.

Orientation, training, employment counseling and placement, English language referral, school placement for children, health and other services that help integrate the refugee into his local community are arranged for or provided by regional offices.

To implement its resettlement programs the Tolstoy Foundation has six offices throughout the United States. Each office is staffed according to the needs of the Tolstoy Foundation-sponsored refugees in the area. Although decreasing refugee arrivals have necessitated staff reductions in the Foundation's New York and regional offices, the various staffs still maintain the capacity to provide services in the native languages of their non-English speaking constituencies. This need is currently being met by part-time interpreter-counselors and volunteers in those offices where the caseload is too small to warrant a full-time employee. Tolstoy Foundation offices are located in New York City (headquarters), Los Angeles, California; Phoenix, Arizona; Salt Lake City, Utah; Ferndale, Michigan; and Woonsocket, Rhode Island.

Tolstoy Foundation regional offices operate under resettlement procedures and guidelines set by the national headquarters. Every office provides program and status reports on a monthly basis to headquarters. At least once a year either the Executive Director, the Director of Immigration and Resettlement, or his assistant, visits the offices to monitor and advise on their resettlement efforts. Annual workshop-conferences are also held for staff development.

Each regional office is provided with funds from which expenditures for food, rent, household items, bedding, some medical and other refugee expenses, as well as office expenses are made. All expenses are accounted for by complete reports made weekly by each office. Complete records with receipts are kept of all expenditures and are on file with the original at headquarters accounting office and copies in each appropriate regional office. Expenditures for each refugee are also noted in his or her file, with running account records for each. Direct contact by phone is maintained for consultation and/or decision on matters for which the Regional Representative needs advice or approval.

Through its regional offices, the Tolstoy Foundation is able to maintain direct contact with each refugee and sponsor through each stage of the resettlement process. Often this contact is maintained for many months or even years after the refugee has arrived in this country.

During fiscal year 1984 the number of refugee arrivals, as anticipated, was reduced. In response to this trend towards decreasing refugee arrivals the Foundation has reduced staff in both its New York and regional offices.

For those refugees arriving in fiscal year 1984, a significant portion of the costs of resettlement were borne by the private funds of the Tolstoy Foundation. These funds come from foundations, bequests, and contributions from individual donors. The Foundation hopes to continue previous levels of support for its resettlement programs in fiscal year 1985.

In addition to the above-described direct financial assistance, each Tolstoy regional office relies to a varying extent on in-kind or service contributions. The work of the Foundation would not be possible without this generous volunteer and community support.

During fiscal year 1984 the Foundation resettled the following number of refugees:

## FISCAL YEAR 1984 ARRIVALS

## (October 1, 1983 - September 30, 1984)

### NEAR EASTERN AND AFRICAN PROGRAM

| | |
|---|---|
| Afghan | 216 |
| Iranian | 102 |
| Ethiopian | 102 |
| TOTAL | 420 |

### EX-USSR AND EASTERN EUROPEAN PROGRAM

| | |
|---|---|
| Armenian | 6 |
| Bulgarian | 15 |
| Czech | 33 |
| Ex-USSR | 30 |
| Hungarian | 96 |
| Polish | 331 |
| Romanian | 617 |
| TOTAL | 1,128 |

### INDOCHINESE PROGRAM

| | |
|---|---|
| Khmer | 195 |
| Laotian | 51 |
| Hmong | 15 |
| Vietnamese | 205 |
| Sino-Khmer | 13 |
| Sino-Vietnamese | 68 |
| Chinese | 5 |
| TOTAL | 552 |

| | |
|---|---|
| TOTAL ALL PROGRAMS | 1,998 |

## UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE

Migration and Refugee Services (MRS)/USCC resettles refugees in the United States through resettlement offices established in the Catholic Dioceses. These diocesan resettlement offices represent community-based involvement with the newly arrived refugees and are responsible for the delivery of basic "core" services and other resettlement services.

The bishops in 164 dioceses have designated responsibility for resettlement and have established one or more resettlement offices. There are currently 182 resettlement offices within the 164 dioceses, so in the majority of States there are several MRS offices.

Each diocesan resettlement office has professional staff and complete social service back-up (usually through the Catholic Charities office). The number of staff per diocese varies with the size of the refugee population and other factors. Staff functions within the resettlement offices are as follows: administration and coordination; community development, including volunteer/sponsor and community resources development; and case management, which includes counseling, case planning, service delivery, referral and follow-up. Additionally, in many communities where a need has been demonstrated, there are staff positions for job development and/or ESL to supplement other community resources.

At the national level, MRS/USCC policies and administration are coordinated by the national office in Washington, D.C., and implemented through the operational headquarters in New York and through four regional offices. The Washington office maintains close liaison with various other programs within USCC (such as education, other Catholic organizations) and contacts with the Federal agencies involved with refugee and immigration affairs. The national office further provides public information, program development and guidance, and technical assistance to the diocesan resettlement offices. In addition to coordinating the movement of refugees from overseas and placement into the communities throughout the U.S., the New York office also serves as a liaison with the American Council for Voluntary International Action (INTERACTION).

The four regional offices - in Arkansas, California, Pennsylvania, and Washington, D.C. - are responsible for directly supporting the diocesan resettlement offices' efforts. To ensure effective implementation of the USCC resettlement philosophy in the dioceses, the regional offices engage in monitoring, evaluation and technical assistance, assist in preparing diocesan budgets, and prepare reports for the national office. These regional offices also present USCC policies to the HHS/ORR regional offices and State refugee coordinators. The coordination and placement of "free" cases is the responsibility of the regional offices. In all such placements, consideration is given to such community factors as job market, housing, viability of sponsorship offers, welfare rate amongst refugees, and legislated placement policies.

In FY 1984, USCC resettled 28,709 refugees. Listed by regional origin they include: East Asia--22,989; Soviet Union and Eastern Europe--3,314; Near East and South Asia--1,497; Latin America--56; and Africa--853.

# WORLD RELIEF

During FY 1984, World Relief, the humanitarian arm of the National Association of Evangelicals, resettled 6,020 of the 71,000 refugees admitted to the United States. The primary mission of the Refugee Services Division (RSD) was to demonstrate its Christian commitment by providing quality resettlement through a thoroughly professional staff and qualified sponsors.

Founded in 1944 to aid post World-War II victims, World Relief is now assisting self-help projects around the world, with a deep commitment to refugees. In cooperation with the United Nations, it is the lead agency in caring for over 16,000 Miskito Indians displaced from Nicaragua to Honduras. It also has large staffs working in the Refugee Processing Centers at Galang in Indonesia and Bataan in the Philippines.

With its International Office in Wheaton, Illinois, World Relief is an active member of the American Council for Voluntary International Action (INTERACTION) and the Association of Evangelical Relief and Development Organizations (AERDO).

## Organization

In the United States, World Relief is a subsidiary corporation of the National Association of Evangelicials, which represents 48 denominations, a plethora of other religious organizations, and approximately 20,000 missionaries throughout the world.

The Refugee Services Division (RSD) of World Relief is administered from its national office near New York City in Congers, New York. World Relief Associate Executive Director, Don Bjork, provides overall direction for the division. Functional management responsibilities were delegated to the Director of Program Services, Dennis Ripley; the Director of Administrative/Financial Services, Marvin Christensen; and Director of Migration/Office Services, Don Hammond.

Under supervision of this senior management team, resettlement activities were carried out through a nationwide network of thirteen professional offices located in metropolitan Boston, New York, Washington (DC), Miami, Atlanta, Chicago (2), Dallas, Phoenix, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle and San Diego.

From the inception of its refugee resettlement program in 1979, World Relief regional offices have generated a larger network of churches, colleges, seminaries, home-mission groups and para-church organizations--which together provide a broad range of support and services for refugees. In FY 1984, this included sponsorships, cash contributions, gifts-in-kind, technical assistance, public relations assistance, and a variety of volunteer services.

## Sponsorship Models

In FY 1984, 397 churches and 819 individuals were officially enlisted by World Relief for sponsorship of refugees. World Relief uses many different kinds of sponsorship, four most commonly:

1. Congregational. In this model, a local church plays the major role in delivery of services, with World Relief regional staff providing systematic professional guidance to the congregation. A caseworker takes the lead in developing an employment plan and monitoring to ensure progress toward refugee self-sufficiency. Other staff provide assistance to the congregation during the pre-arrival period, with support, counseling, and monitoring during the post-arrival period.
2. American Family. In this model, an American family or cluster of families provides core services, with World Relief staff lending the same professional assistance as in all models.
3. Refugee Family. This model is used primarily for cases where a refugee family is reunited with a relative in the United States. Prior to arrival, World Relief staff work with the anchor relative to develop a resettlement plan, which carefully delineates responsibility for delivery of core services. Degree of responsibility is relative to resources and capabilities, with World Relief staff developing supplemental goods and services. Again, a caseworker is assigned to the family to provide professional support and direction.
4. Office. In this model, World Relief paid staff, supplemented by community volunteers, provide direct core services to the refugee or refugee family.

## Job Training

World Relief is committed to rapid assimilation of refugees into the American way of life. A constant goal is to settle refugees in non-impacted areas that are enjoying economic growth. Regional offices have designed many programs in which public and private resources are combined to reach this goal. During FY 1984, one such program enlisted a local industry to teach work skills and English-as-a-Second-Language to 110 refugees. Later, the company hired them all.

## Community Involvement

As a valuable adjunct to it resettlement activities, World Relief's RSD is participating in a variety of community services. It has taken the lead in projects such as the Maryland Refugee Advisory Committee, the Metro D.C. Coalition for Refugee Resettlement, a task force on Caribbean immigration and the Chinese Mutual Aid Association.

Typically, one regional office developed a network of 25 congregational groups to build community relationships. Another generated an extensive metropolitan directory of social services.

### Refugees Resettled During FY 1984

| Region of Origin | Cases | People |
|---|---|---|
| Africa | 185 | 343 |
| Europe | 196 | 330 |
| Indochina | 1,358 | 5,118 |
| Near East | 68 | 222 |
| Latin America | 196 | 330 |
| TOTAL | 1,811 | 6,020 |

# APPENDIX D

# STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS

## STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS

### REGION I/II

**Connecticut**
Mr. Edward Savino, State Coordinator
Dept. of Human Resources
1179 Main Street
Hartford, Conn. 06115 (203) 566-4329

**Maine**
Mr. David Stauffer, State Coordinator/ORR
Bureau of Resource Development
Maine Dept. of Human Services
Augusta, Maine 04330 (207) 289-2971

**Massachusetts:**
Mr. Daniel Lam, State Refugee Coordinator
Dept. of Public Welfare
600 Washington Street - 4th Floor
Room 405
Boston, MA 02111 (617) 727-8190 or 727-7888

**New Hampshire:**
Ms. Susan Calegari, State Coordinator/ORR
Division of Human Resources
11 Depot Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301 (603) 271-2611

**Rhode Island**
Cleo LaChapelle
State Coordinator/ORR
Dept. of Social & Rehabilitative Serv.
600 New London Avenue
Cranston, RI 02920 (401) 464-2127

**Vermont:**
Ms. Judith May, State Coordinator/ORR
Charlestown Road
Springfield, Vermont 05156 (802) 885-9602

**New Jersey:**
Ms. Rowina Bopp
State Coordinator
Commissioner's Office
Department of Human Services
CN 700
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
(609) 984-3470

Ms. Jane Burger
Refugee Services Coordinator
Division of Youth & Family Serv.
1 South Montgomery Street
(609) 292-8395

**New York:**
Mr. Bruce Bushart
State Coordinator
40 North Pearl Street
Albany, New York 12243
(518) 474-9629
Contact: Mr. Joseph Ryu
(518-474-9629)

## REGION III

| | |
|---|---|
| **Delaware:**<br>Ms. Janet Loper<br>Refugee Coordinator<br>Division of Economic Services<br>Department of Health & Social Services<br>P.O. Box 906, CP Building<br>New Castle, Delaware 19720 | (302) 421-6153 |
| **District of Columbia:**<br>Mr. Wallace Lumpkin, Director<br>Refugee Resettlement Program<br>Dept. of Human Services<br>801 North Capitol Street, N.E. Rm 336<br>Washington, D.C. 20002 | (202) 727-5588 |
| **Maryland:**<br>Mr. Frank J. Bien, State Coordinator<br>Maryland Office of Refugee Affairs<br>Department of Human Resources<br>Rooms 621-625<br>101 West Read Road<br>Baltimore, Maryland 21202 | (301) 659-1863 |
| **Pennsylvania:**<br>Mr. Gary Yoh, Director<br>Bureau of Contract & Program Support Services<br>Department of Public Welfare, Office of Children, Youth and Families<br>P.O. Box 2675<br>Harrisburg, PA 17105 | (717) 783-3856 |
| **Virginia:**<br>Ms. Donna Douglas<br>Acting Refugee Coordinator<br>Virginia Department of Social Services<br>Blair Building<br>8007 Discovery Drive<br>P.O. Box K-176<br>Richmond, VA 23288 | (804) 281-9010 |
| **West Virginia**<br>Ms. Cheryl Brua<br>Refugee Coordinator<br>West Virginia Department of Human Services<br>1900 Washington Street, East<br>Charleston, W. Virginia 25305 | (304) 885-8290 |

## REGION IV

**Alabama:**
Mr. Joel Sanders
State Refugee Coordinator, Bureau of Social Services
Dept. of Pensions & Security, 2nd Floor
64 N. Union Street
Montgomery, AL 36130 (205) 261-2925

**Georgia:**
Mr. Mark Hendrix
State Refugee Coordinator
Division of Family & Children's Services
Office of Planning & Development/DHR
878 Peachtree Street, N.E., Room 401
Atlanta, GA 30309 (404) 894-4487

**Kentucky:**
Mr. Roy Butler, State Refugee Coordinator
Dept. of Human Resources, Bureau for Social Insurance
275 East Main Street
Frankfort, KY 40621 (502) 564-3556

**Mississippi:**
Ms. Jane Lee, State Refugee Coordinator
Mississippi Dept. of Public Welfare
P.O. Box 352
Jackson, Mississippi 39205 (601) 354-0341 Ext. 221

**North Carolina:**
Mr. Robert B. Edmundson, Jr.
State Refugee Coordinator
Family Services Section/Dept. of Human Resources
325 North Salisbury Street
Raleigh, NC 27611 (919) 733-4650

**South Carolina:**
Mr. Tri Huu Tran, State Refugee Coordinator
Agency for Refugee Resettlement
Division of Social Services
P.O. Box 1520
1520 Confederate Avenue
Columbia, SC 29202-9988 (803) 758-8301

**Tennessee:**
Ms. Allison W. Balthrop
State Refugee Coordinator
Tennessee Dept. of Human Services
111-19 Seventh Ave., North
Nashville, TN 37203 (615) 741-5930

## Florida Office of Refugee Resettlement

Florida:
Ms. Nancy Wittenberg, Refugee Programs Administrator
Dept. of Health & Rehabilitative Services
1317 Winewood Blvd., Building 1, Rm 420
Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (904) 488-3791

## REGION V

**Illinois: Coordinators**

Ms. Ann Kiley
Associate Director
Office of Social Services
Illinois Dept. of Public Aid
Room 624, 13th Floor
624 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60605
(312) 793-3151

**Program Managers**

Mr. Edwin Silverman
Refugee Resettlement Program
Dept. of Public Aid
Bureau of Social Services
624 S. Michigan Ave., 9th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60605
(312) 793-7120

**Indiana:**

Mr. Robert Igney
Policy and Program Development
Indiana Dept. of Welfare
141 S. Meridian St. 4th Floor
Indianapolis, Ind. 46204
(317) 232-4975

**Michigan:**

Ms. Paula Stark, Director
Ofc. of Employment Development Serv.
Dept. of Social Services
300 S. Capitol Avenue, Suite 711
Lansing, Michigan 48926
(517) 373-7382

Ms. Joyce Savale
Michigan Res. Asst. Off.
Dept. of Social Services
Michigan Plaza Bldg. Suite 462
1200 Sixth Street
Detroit, Michigan 48226
(313) 256-9776

**Minnesota:**

Ms. Jane Kretzmann
Coordinator of Refugee Programs
Minnesota Dept. of Public Welfare
Space Center Building, 2nd Floor
444 LaFayette Road
St. Paul, Minn. 55101

(612) 296-2754

**Ohio:**

Mr. Michael M. Seidemann
Department of Public Welfare
Program Development Division
State Office Tower -- 30th Fl
30 E. Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 466-5848

**Wisconsin:**

Ms. Sue Levy
Wisconsin Ref. Assist. Off.
Dept. of Health & Social Services,
Rm 480
P.O. Box 7851
Madison, Wisconsin 53707

(608) 266-8354

## REGION VI

**Arkansas:**
Mr. Curtis Ivery, Executive Director
Division of Social Services
Arkansas Dept. of Human Services
State Coordinator for Refugee Resettlement
Donaghey Bldg., Suite 1300
P.O. Box 1437
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203
ATTENTION: Glendine Fincher
Manager of the Refugee Resettlement Unit
(501) 371-2434

**Louisiana:**
Ms. Joan Abed (504) 342-2763
State Refugee Coordinator
Office of Human Development
Dept. of Health & Human Services
1755 Florida Street
P.O. Box 44367
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804
ATTENTION: Marsha Daigle
Manager of the Refugee Resettlement Unit
(504) 342-2765

**New Mexico:**
Mr. Facundo Raul Rodriguez
State Coordinator of Refugee Programs
New Mexico Human Services Department
Pera Building, Rm 104
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503
(505) 827-4198

**Oklahoma:**
Mr. Robert Fulton
Human Services
(Coordinator for Refugee Resettlement)
Dept. of Institutions
Social & Rehabilitative Services
P.O. Box 25352
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73125
ATTENTION: Jim Hancock
Manager of the Refugee Resettlement Unit
(405) 521-3431

**Texas:**
Mr. M.J. Raymond (512) 441-3355 Ext. 2055
Assistant Commissioner for Coordination
(State Coordinator for Refugee Programs)
Texas Department of Human Services
706 Bannister Lane
P.O. Box 2960
Austin, Texas 78769
ATTENTION: Ms. Lee Russell
Manager, Refugee Programs (512) 450-4172

## REGION VII/VIII

Colorado:
Ms. Laurie Bagan
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Colorado Refugee Services Program
Department of Social Services
950 Broadway, Suite 150
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 8-863-8211

Iowa
Marvin Weidner
Refugee Program Coordinator
Iowa Refugee Service Center
4626 S.W. 9th Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
(515) 281-3119

Kansas
Mr. Phil Gutierrez
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Dept. of Social &
Rehabilitation Services
State Office Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612
(913) FTS: 8-296-3374

Missouri
Ms. Patricia Harris
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Division of Family Services/Special Programs
911 B Missouri Blvd.
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
(314) 751-4224

Montana:
Ms. Norma Harris
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Dept. of Soc. and Rehabilitation Serv.
111 Sanders
Helena, Montana 59601
(406) 449-3865

Mr. Boyce Fowler
Refugee Program Manager

Nebraska
Ms. Maria Diaz
Coordinator of Refugee Affairs
Department of Social Service
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509
(402) 471-2121

## REGION VII/VIII (continued)

North Dakota:
Ms. Shirley Dykshoorn
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Dept. of Human Services
State Capitol, 3rd Floor
New Office Wing
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505 (701) 224-4809

South Dakota:
Mr. Vern Guericke
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Department of Social Services
Kneip Building
Illinois Street
Pierre, South Dakota 57501 (605) 773-3493

Utah:
Mr. Terry Moore
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Division of Children Youth & Family
Dept. of Social Services
150 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84103 (801) 533-7129

Wyoming:
Mr. Steve Vajda
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Department of Health and Social Services
390 Hathaway Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002 (307) 777-6100

## REGION IX

**Arizona:**
Ms. Regina Murphy Darling
Office of Refugee Resettlement
40 N. Swan Rd.
Suite 218
Tucson, AZ 85911

Program Manager

Tucson: (602) 628-5897
Phoenix (602) 255-3826

**California:**
Ms. Linda McMahon, Director
Dept. of Social Services
744 P. Street
Sacramento, Calif. 95814
(916) 445-2077

Mr. Walter Barnes, Acting Chief
Office of Refugee Services
Dept. of Social Services
744 P. Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 324-1576

**Guam:**
Mr. Dennis Rodriguez, Director
Dept. of Health & Social Services
Government of Guam
Agana, Guam 96910

011-671-734-2974

**Hawaii:**
Mr. Franklin Y.K. Sunn, Director
Dept. of Social Services & Housing
State of Hawaii
P.O. Box 339
Honolulu, HI 96809
808-548-6260

Contact: Linda Henning
808-548-8480

**Nevada:**
Mr. William La Badie
Refugee Program Coordinator
Dept. of Human Resources, Welfare Division
430 Jeanell Drive
Carson City, NV 89710

(702) 885-4709

## REGION X

**Idaho:**
JoAnn Davich
State Refugee Coordinator
Dept. of Health & Welfare
Refugee Services Program
450 West State Street
7th Floor
Boise, Idaho 83720
(208) 334-2631

**Oregon:**
Mr. Ron Bassett-Smith
State Refugee Coordinator
Dept. of Human Resources
100 Public Service Building
Salem, Oregon 97310
(503) 373-7177

**Washington:**
Ms. Liz Dunbar
State Refugee Coordinator
Bureau of Refugee Assistance
Dept. of Social & Health Services
Mail Stop 31-B
Olympia, WA 98504
(206) 753-3086

## APPENDIX E

## CDC HEALTH PROGRAM FOR REFUGEES

# CDC HEALTH PROGRAM FOR REFUGEES
# PROJECT GRANT AWARDS
# FY 1984

## REGION I

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut<br>($79,611) | Douglas Lloyd, M.D.<br>Connecticut Department of Health Services<br>Preventable Diseases Division<br>150 Washington Street<br>Hartford, CT 06106 |
| Maine<br>($16,007) | William S. Nersesian, M.D.<br>Maine Department of Human Services<br>Bureau of Health<br>State House, Station 11<br>Augusta, ME 04333 |
| Massachusetts<br>($164,989) | Bailus Walker, Jr., Ph.D., M.P.H.<br>Commissioner<br>Massachusetts Department of Public Health<br>Division of Tuberculosis Control<br>150 Tremont Street<br>Boston, MA 02111 |
| New Hampshire<br>($6,661) | Elizabeth A. Burtt, RN, MS, MPH<br>Bureau of Communicable Disease Control<br>Health and Welfare Building<br>Hazen Drive<br>Concord, NH 03301 |
| Rhode Island<br>($43,154) | Joseph E. Cannon, M.D.<br>Rhode Island Department of Health<br>75 Davis Street<br>Providence, RI 02908 |
| Vermont<br>($16,968) | Roberta A. Coffin, M.D.<br>Vermont Department of Health<br>Medical Services Division<br>115 Colchester Avenue<br>Burlington, VA 05401 |

## REGION II[1]

| | |
|---|---|
| New Jersey<br>($93,195) | William E. Parkin, D.V.M.<br>State Epidemiologist<br>Division of Epidemiology<br>New Jersey State Department of Health<br>CN 360<br>Trenton, NJ 08625 |
| New York<br>($326,221) | Dale L. Morse, M.D.<br>New York State Department of Health<br>Tower Building, Empire State Plaza<br>Albany, NY 12237 |

## REGION III

| | |
|---|---|
| District of Columbia<br>($75,500) | Mr. Richard H. Hollenkamp<br>D.C. Department of Human Services<br>801 North Capitol Street, N.E.<br>Washington, D.C. 20002 |
| Maryland<br>($97,159) | Edith L. Wilson, Ph.D.<br>Department of Health and Mental Hygiene<br>O'Conor Building<br>201 West Preston Street<br>Baltimore, MD 21201 |
| Pennsylvania<br>($104,835) | Ms. Patricia Tyson<br>Pennsylvania Department of Health<br>Division of Rehabilitation<br>Post Office Box 90<br>Harrisburg, PA 17120 |
| Philadelphia<br>($106,812) | Mr. Barry Savitz<br>City of Philadelphia<br>Department of Public Health<br>Family Medical Care Services<br>500 South Broad Street<br>Philadelphia, PA 19146 |
| Virginia<br>($108,883) | James B. Kenley, M.D.<br>Virginia Department of Health<br>Office of Management for Community Health Services<br>109 Governor Street<br>Richmond, VA 23219 |

---

[1] Delaware and West Virginia did not apply for FY 84 funds.

## REGION IV[2]

Alabama
($10,795)

Mr. H.E. Harrison
Director, Bureau of Area Health Services
Alabama Department of Public Health
State Office Building, Room 307
Montgomery, AL 36130

Florida
($101,534)

Mr. Stephen H. King
Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services
1323 Winewood Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Georgia
($127,149)

James G. Ledbetter, Ph.D.
Commissioner
Georgia Department of Human Resources
47 Trinity Avenue, S.W.
Atlanta, GA 30334

Kentucky
($25,471)

Charles D. Bunch
Barren River District Health Department
Post Office Box 1157
Bowling Green, KY 42102

North Carolina
($50,597)

Ms. Dara L. Murphy
N.C. Department of Human Resources
North Carolina Division of Health Services
Post Office Box 2019
Raleigh, NC 27602

South Carolina
($23,871)

Mr. Logan Merritt
Bureau of Disease Control
South Carolina Department of Health
and Environmental Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, SC 29201

Tennessee
($80,618)

James Hatmaker
Tennessee Department of Public Health
R.S. Gass State Office Building
Ben Allen Road
Nashville, TN 37216

## REGION V

Illinois
($338,000)

Mr. Fred H. Uhlig
Illinois Department of Public Health
535 West Jefferson Street
Springfield, IL 62761

Indiana
($60,000)

Charles L. Barrett, M.D.
Director, Communicable Disease Control
Indiana State Board of Health
1330 West Michigan
Indianapolis, IN 46206

---

[2] Mississippi did not apply for FY 84 funds.

## REGION V (CONT'D)

| | |
|---|---|
| Michigan<br>($60,000) | Mr. Norman B. Keon<br>Michigan Department of Public Health<br>Bureau of Disease Control and Lab Services<br>3500 North Logan Street<br>Post Office Box 30035<br>Lansing, MI 48909 |
| Minnesota<br>($160,000) | Andrew Dean, M.D.<br>Director, Division of Disease Prevention<br>Minnesota Department of Health<br>717 Delaware Street, S.E.<br>Minneapolis, MN 55440 |
| Ohio<br>($105,000) | Thomas J. Halpin, M.D.<br>Chief, Bureau of Preventive Medicine<br>Ohio Department of Health<br>246 North High Street<br>Post Office Box 118<br>Columbus, OH 43216 |
| Wisconsin<br>($90,639) | Mr. Ivan E. Imm<br>Director, Bureau of Prevention<br>Wisconsin Department of Health<br>Division of Health<br>One West Wilson Street<br>Post Office Box 309<br>Madison, WI 43711 |

## REGION VI

| | |
|---|---|
| Arkansas<br>($41,590) | Mr. Charles W. McGraw, M.P.H.<br>Bureau of Public Programs<br>Arkansas Department of Health<br>4815 West Markham Street<br>Little Rock, AR 72201 |
| Louisiana<br>($85,000) | Charles T. Caraway, D.V.M.<br>Director of Disease Control<br>Louisiana Department of Health<br>Post Office Box 60630<br>New Orleans, LA 70160 |
| New Mexico<br>($50,600) | Randall Hays, M.D.<br>Chief, Chronic Disease Control<br>New Mexico Health and Environmental Department<br>Health Services Division<br>Post Office Box 968<br>Santa Fe, NM 87504 |

## REGION VI (CONT'D)

| | |
|---|---|
| Oklahoma<br>($67,383) | Mr. Stephen W. Roncl<br>Oklahoma State Department of Health<br>Post Office Box 53551<br>Oklahoma City, OK 73152 |
| Texas<br>($354,117) | Ms. Eleanor R. Eisenberg<br>Texas Department of Health<br>Refugee Health Screening Program<br>1100 West 49th Street<br>Austin, TX 78756 |

## REGION VII[3]

| | |
|---|---|
| Iowa<br>($113,005) | Mr. Norman L. Pawlewski<br>Commissioner of Health<br>Iowa State Department of Health<br>Lucas State Office Building<br>Des Moines, IA 50319 |
| Kansas<br>($80,000) | Joseph G. Hollowell, Jr., M.D.<br>Director, Bureau of Epidemiology<br>Kansas Department of Health and Environment<br>Forbes AFB, Building 740<br>Topeka, KS 66620 |
| Missouri<br>($26,995) | H. Denny Donnell, Jr., M.D.<br>Missouri Department of Social Services<br>Division of Health<br>Post Office Box 570<br>Jefferson City, MO 65102 |

## REGION VIII[4]

| | |
|---|---|
| Colorado<br>($92,085) | Richard S. Hopkins, M.D.<br>Chief, Communicable Disease Control<br>Colorado Department of Health<br>4120 East 11th Avenue<br>Denver, CO 80220 |
| Montana<br>($18,544) | Mr. Dennis Lang<br>Missoula City-County Health Department<br>301 West Alder<br>Missoula, MT 59802 |

---

[3] Nebraska did not apply for FY 84 funds.
[4] Wyoming did not apply for FY 84 funds.

## REGION VIII (CONT'D)

North Dakota
($12,000)

Mr. Fred F. Heer
North Dakota State Department of Health
Disease Control Division
State Capitol
Bismarck, ND 58505

South Dakota
($17,570)

Mr. Kenneth A. Senger
South Dakota State Department of Health
Communicable Disease Control
Joe Foss Building
523 E. Capitol
Pierre, SD 57501

Utah
($64,575)

LaDene Larson
Utah State Department of Health
Chronic Disease Control
825 North 300 West
Post Office Box 2500
Salt Lake City, UT 84110

## REGION IX

Arizona
($56,396)

Robert G. Harmon, M.D.
Director, Division of Public Health
Maricopa County Health Department
Post Office box 2111
Phoenix, AZ 85001

California
($1,989,038)

Peter Abbott, M.D.
State of California Department of Health
714 P. Street, Room 1300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Hawaii
($85,603)

Leslie Matsubara
Hawaii Department of Health
Director's Office
Post Office Box 3378
Honolulu, HI 96801

Nevada
($50,205)

MR. Franklin M. Holzhauer
Administrator
Nevada State Department of Human Resources
Division of Health
505 E. King Street, Room 200
Carson City, NV 89710

## REGION X[5]

Idaho
($14,469)

Ms. Rosemary Shaber, RN
North Central District Health Department
Physical Health Division
1221 F. Street
Lewiston, ID 83501

Oregon
($150,539)

Mr. David M. Gurule
Oregon State Health Division
Office of Community Health Services
Post Office Box 231
Portland, OR 97207

Washington
($266,617)

Mr. Gary Johnson
Department of Social and Health Services
Health Services Division
M/S LJ-12
Olympia, WA 98504

---

[5] Alaska did not apply for FY 84 funds.

*U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1985-527-722/30330